DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 230 694	CE 036 052
AUTHOR	Rist, Ray C.; And Others
TITLE	Forging New Relationships: The CETA/School Nexus. A Study in the Coordination of Education and Employment Services. Interim Report #1.
INSTITUTION	State Univ. of New York, Ithaca. Coll. of Human Ecology at Cornell Univ.; Youthwork, Inc., Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Labor, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Jun 79
NOTE	164p.; For related documents, see ED 224 901-903 and CE 036 049-053.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Career Education; Credits; Demonstration Programs; Disadvantaged Youth; *Economically Disadvantaged; *Educational Cooperation; Employment Programs; *Employment Services; Federal Legislation; Federal Programs; Incentives; Institutional Cooperation; Job Development; *Job Training; Low Income Groups; Minority Groups; Out of School Youth; Postsecondary Education; Program Development; School Business Relationship; School Districts; Secondary Education; Vocational Education; Work Experience; Youth Employment; *Youth Programs
IDENTIFIERS	*Comprehensive Employment and Training Act; Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act; *Youth Employment Training Program; Youthwork Incorporated; Youthwork National Policy Study

ABSTRACT

An assessment is provided of the ability of Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) prime sponsors and local educational agencies to cooperate in the development of innovative educational and training programs for low-income youth. The data presented are based on observations and interviews conducted at 40 of 47 operational sites administered by Youthwork, Inc. Following an introduction are four substantive chapters, one on each of the four program areas where projects were selected and funded: expanded private sector involvement, job creation through youth operated projects, academic credit for work experience, and career information. Key areas of investigation in each of the programmatic areas include the form and content of CETA/school collaboration and communication, the impact of the Youth Employment and Training Program's 22 percent incentive on inter-institutional cooperation, and the question of whether the Youthwork programs have created duplication and redundancy in efforts to assist in-school youth. Recommendations for the Department of Labor and Youthwork, Inc. are located at the end of each chapter. A methodological appendix includes two analysis packets covering CETA/school relations and a statement of key issues on that topic. (YLB)

ED230694

FORGING NEW RELATIONSHIPS: THE CETA/SCHOOL NEXUS

a study in the coordination of education and employment services

Interim Report #1

Ray C. Rist, Principal Investigator
Gilbert W. Gillespie
Mary Agnes Hamilton
Wilfred B. Holloway
Steven D. Johnson
Heather E. Wiltberger

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
R Rist
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

YOUTHWORK NATIONAL POLICY STUDY
Cornell University
June 1979

CE036052

youthwork national policy study
n124 mvr hall
cornell university
ithaca new york 14853

(607)256 4431

OVERVIEW

to

Forging New Relationships: the CETA/School Nexus

This report is the first of a series of Interim Reports to be prepared by the Youthwork National Policy Study on various aspects of implementation by local sponsors of the Exemplary In-School Demonstration Project. This project has been funded by the Department of Labor through an intermediary non-profit corporation, Youthwork, Inc.

The report pays particular attention to the matter of relations between CETA and various educational organizations, most particularly Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) and postsecondary institutions. Both the form and content of these relations are thought to be particularly important in enabling the goals of the Youth Employment and Demonstration Project Act (YEDPA) to be achieved. Of most immediate concern is isolating and analyzing those mechanisms of cooperation and communication which will enable both CETA and the schools to overcome the barriers between school and work by more closely linking education, employment, and training institutions.

The focus for this assessment of CETA/school relations is within the four programmatic areas established by the Youthwork project. These four areas are private sector involvement, youth initiated activities, academic credit for work experience, and career information.

Additional copies of this report may be obtained by writing in care of the above address.

June 1979

a collaborative project of Youthwork, Inc. and New York State College of Human Ecology, a statutory college of the state university

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE....................ii

ACRONYMS and ABBREVIATIONS....................viii

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS....................ix

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION....................1

CETA/School Relations: Defining the Issues........6

CHAPTER TWO: EXPANDED PRIVATE SECTOR INVOLVEMENT................11

Factors Influencing Communication/Collaboration....18
The 22 Percent Incentive....................26
Program Duplication....................29
Summary and Recommendations....................32

CHAPTER THREE: JOB CREATION THROUGH YOUTH OPERATED PROJECTS.......38

CETA/Schools Communication and Collaboration.......41
Twenty-two Percent Incentive....................47
Duplication of Services....................48
Program Operation: CETA vs. LEA....................49
Small Cities vs. Large Metropolitan Areas..........52
Rural Projects....................53
Activities Offered at Youth Operated Projects......54
Summary and Policy Recommendations................57

CHAPTER FOUR: ACADEMIC CREDIT FOR WORK EXPERIENCE................61

CETA/School Communication and Collaboration........65
Twenty-Two Percent Incentive....................72
Duplication....................73
Awarding Academic Credit for Work Experience.......74
Summary and Recommendations....................81

CHAPTER FIVE: CAREER INFORMATION....85

- Description of Sites....87
- CETA/School Communication and Collaboration....91
- Twenty-Two Percent Incentive....103
- Duplication of Services....106
- Project Administrative Demands....108
- Summary and Recommendations....110

REFERENCES....115

METHODOLOGICAL APPENDIX....117

- Introduction....117
- Theoretical Rationale....119
- The General Research Plan....121
- Strengths and Limitations of the Data....127
- Forging New Relationships: The CETA/School Nexus..128
- Analysis Packet I....131
- Analysis Packet II....138
- References....141

PREFACE

The Youth Employment and Demonstrations Projects Act (YEDPA) became law on August 5, 1977. It amended the 1973 Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) so as to provide the initiative for an expanded effort to address the problems of youth unemployment. YEDPA added several new programs to improve employment and training opportunities for young people in their late teens and early twenties, particularly those from low-income families. It has sought to emphasize experimentation and innovation on the part of the CETA local government sponsor system, more than has been the case with programs developed for unemployed adults.

The Act is particularly concerned with overcoming the barriers between school and work by more closely linking education, employment, and training institutions. It seeks to forge new relationships. One of the four programs authorized by YEDPA was that of the Youth Employment and Training Program (YETP). This program was designed to provide a full range of work experiences and skills necessary for future employment, especially for those low-income youth, 16 to 21 years of age who are in school or out of school and unemployed or underemployed. Certain YETP provisions also allow designated forms of participation by youth 14 and 15 years old, as well as by youth who are not economically disadvantaged.

Under the YETP provisions, 22 percent of the fiscal resources are to be reserved for serving in-school youth under the terms of an agreement between the local educational agencies and the CETA prime sponsors. The aim of these agreements is to coordinate education and employment efforts by the various agencies involved so as to better prepare youth for the world of work.

What provides a sense of urgency to this effort is that there is a desperate need both to improve the education of low-income minority youth and to find the means by which to create more employment for them. The evidence on this point is both conclusive and sobering: the situation for poor minority youth, as compared with white middle-class youth, has steadily deteriorated over the past 15 years. Whether one measures employment rates or labor force participation rates, the disparities have grown and continue to do so. This is in spite of all the education, employment, and training programs initiated since the mid-1960s and carried on to the present.

The spending level for YEDPA for fiscal year 1979 is estimated to be approximately $1.2 billion. The first priority for these funds is to generate employment opportunities for youth. As such, they have become an integral component of efforts by the administration to reduce the present levels of unemployment. Nevertheless, and in recognition that present approaches to reduce youth unemployment are imperfect, both in design and implementation, the Act authorizes the Secretary of Labor to allocate up to one-fifth of YEDPA funds on demonstration projects to support knowledge development. The mandate from the Congress was clear:

> Sec. 321. It is the purpose of this part to establish a variety of employment, training, and demonstration programs to explore methods of dealing with the structural unemployment problems

> of the nation's youth. The basic purpose of the demonstration programs shall be to test the relative efficacy of the different ways of dealing with these problems in different local contexts.
>
> Sec. 348. ...to carry out innovative and experimental programs, to test new approaches for dealing with the unemployment problems of youth, and to enable eligible participants to prepare for, enhance their prospects for, or secure employment in occupations through which they may reasonably be expected to advance to productive working lives. Such programs shall include, where appropriate, cooperative arrangements with educational agencies to provide special programs and services....

The monies that were to be distributed according to formula among the local sponsors of programs for in-school youth would alleviate some unemployment and "buy time." Yet there was little confidence that, in the end, these projects would either address the long-term needs of the youth or provide new insights into how programs might be more effectively organized and implemented so as to have a greater impact. New ideas, new approaches, and new actors would have to be on the scene if innovative and path-breaking approaches were to be found. And while it was not explicit in the legislation, it can be surmised that it was the hope of the authors that if successful projects could be located where jobs were created and the youth were prepared to assume them, then perhaps cities and states would be encouraged to redirect portions of the 80 percent formula funds towards projects of this kind. Thus the discretionary funds projects could achieve a ripple effect throughout the entire infrastructure of youth employment and training programs.

To learn more about one aspect of the complex set of relations between education and present/future employment opportunities, the Department of Labor set aside from the discretionary funds approximately $15 million for "Exemplary In-School Demonstration Projects." These grants were to explore the dynamics of in-school projects and their effectiveness. They also would be awarded to promote cooperation between the education and employment and training systems.

To assist the Department of Labor and its regional offices in undertaking this effort, Youthwork, Inc., an intermediary non-profit corporation, was established in January, 1978. It was created with financial and administrative support from the Field Foundation, the Public Welfare Foundation, the Southern Education Foundation, the Taconic Foundation, and the Eleanor Roosevelt Institute. Youthwork's responsibilities were to include: developing guidelines for the competition to select the Exemplary In-School Demonstration Projects, reviewing submitted proposals, making recommendations for funding, providing guidance and technical assistance for those projects selected in the competition, developing and implementing a knowledge development plan so as to increase understanding of different approaches and their effectiveness, and forwarding reports and recommendations to the Department of Labor.

As a result of a five-tier evaluation process designed to select from among the more than 520 submitted proposals, Youthwork made its recommendations to the Department of Labor. Forty-eight projects were chosen. The first contracts were signed and projects began operation in September, 1978. Forty-seven of the original 48 projects are now (June, 1979) operational.

To assess these projects and their efficacy in achieving the twin goals of program effectiveness and inter-institutional collaboration, Youthwork undertook a number of knowledge development efforts. These were to include the use of analytic ethnographic material collected by a trained observer placed at each project, third-party evaluators, MIS systems, and self-study reports from the individual projects.

For the first of these efforts, that of developing a cross-site comparative framework employing qualitative data collection strategies, Youthwork, Inc., selected in September 1978 a group of researchers at the College of Human Ecology, Cornell University. The Cornell project, entitled "Youthwork National Policy Study," has undertaken a longitudinal case study research program. Trained observers at each of the project sites have been gathering data in specified areas designated and developed by mutual agreement of the Department of Labor, Youthwork, and the Cornell University research team.

Forging New Relationships: The CETA/Schools Nexus is the first of the interim reports to be presented by the Youthwork National Policy Study. The report provides a systematic and detailed assessment of the ability of CETA prime sponsors and local educational agencies to come together to develop innovative education and training programs for low-income youth, a key goal of the YETP legislation. The data presented here are based on observations and interviews conducted at 40 of the 47 operational sites. Programs underway in 28 states are included in this report. A second interim report, to be prepared in August 1979 will explore the dynamics of in-school programs and their impact, both upon the organizations who conceived and implemented them, and upon the participants who experienced them.

The report is divided into six chapters: the Introduction, four substantive chapters, one each on the four program areas where projects were selected and funded, and the Conclusions. Key areas of investigation in each of the programmatic areas include the form and content of CETA/schools communication and collaboration, the impact of the YETP 22 percent incentive on inter-institutional cooperation, and the question of whether there now exists a duplication of programs aimed at the same target populations.

Appreciation must be expressed both to the on-site observers who have consistently performed with a level of excellence and to the local project personnel who have been generous with their time and candid in their responses. As a means to protect those who have been part of this sizeable knowledge development project, anonymity was promised from the beginning. Those who have participated will know who they are; perhaps they will recognize themselves amidst the descriptive and interview material. They all have our thanks.

A number of persons have reviewed earlier drafts of this report and generously shared their comments and suggestions. Staff from the office of Youth Programs in the U.S. Department of Labor, members of the staff of the U.S. Senate Committee on Human Resources, staff from the Select Subcommittee on Education, U.S. House of Representatives, and colleagues from here at Cornell have all contributed their insights. Of particular import has been the effort of Dr. Michael Langsdorf from Youthwork, Inc. I am indebted for their assistance and cooperation.

Ray C. Rist
Principal Investigator
June, 1979

ACRONYMS and ABBREVIATIONS

CBO	Community Based Organization
CETA	Comprehensive Employment and Training Act
DOL	Department of Labor
ETA	Employment and Training Administration
LEA	Local Education Agency
OJT	on-the-job training
OYP	Office of Youth Programs
PNP	public non-profit
PrNP	private non-profit
RFP	Request for Proposal
SEP	Student Employment Program
SPEDY	Summer Program for Economically Disadvantaged Youth
YCCIP	Youth Community Conservation and Improvement Projects
YEDPA	Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act
YES	Youth Employment Service
YETP	Youth Employment and Training Program

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Youthwork, Inc. is an intermediary corporation created in January, 1978 by a consortium of five private foundations. It was established in order to assist the Office of Youth Programs, U.S. Department of Labor, and implement the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act of 1977. An intermediary corporation is a private, non-profit organization which assists government agencies to program public funds. Youthwork is thus an intermediary between the private and public sectors.

At present Youthwork administers more than $15 million of Department of Labor funds to 48 projects testing various mixes of schooling, counseling, job training, and part-time employment. These demonstrations are aimed at understanding the forms of CETA/school cooperation and collaboration in the provision of services to youth. The particular projects selected for funding through a competitive process are those which give evidence of being particularly informative on the matter of how to foster closer cooperation between educational systems of various types (high schools, alternative schools, community colleges, universities), local employers, and job training institutions, including especially the CETA prime sponsors.

This report is an interim report on the form and content of CETA/school relations which emerged during the first nine months of the Youthwork program, September 1978 to May 1979. It is the first of a number of such reports to be prepared by the Youthwork National Policy Study, located at Cornell University. The report addresses the circumstances and incentives which either facilitate or hinder the ability of CETA prime sponsors and local educational agencies to come together to develop innovative education and training programs for low-income youth.

The report finds that the operational requirements of inter-institutional cooperation and collaboration, together with the need for continual attention to CETA regulations and the requirements of paperwork, created a set of difficult programmatic challenges. The lack of synchronization, for example, between the program and the school system created a set of obstacles that often forced program postponements and generated strains between the collaborators. As but another example, the inability to provide a clear set of policy guidelines on how the funds generated from the youth initiated projects could be spent also generated program postponements and reductions in the number of youth who could participate. The examples could continue, but the point is made: collaboration to implement a program needs time to overcome the procedural incompatibilities between prime sponsors and local educational agencies. The obstacles hinder cooperation; they do not prohibit it.

While it is still too early to draw firm conclusions and posit final recommendations about the potential for forging CETA/school relations to service in-school, low-income youth, there are clear patterns emerging which bear close observation and study. Given time for programs to stabilize and the relationships to weather various strains and tensions, the Exemplary In-School Demonstration Projects should provide definitive insights in answering the question of "what works when and why?"

CETA/LEA Communication/Collaboration

A key policy question regarding in-school programs to address youth unemployment is how to produce programs which meld the resources and expertise of CETA and the educational systems. The potential impact of combined resources, provided at a lower cost, could thus reach larger numbers of target population youth with both education and employment training and experience. What then facilitates or impedes CETA/school communication and collaboration on programs designed to reach low-income, in-school youth?

Patterns of communication and collaboration. CETA/school relations tended in the first months of program implementation to be limited to operational and administrative matters: interpretation of regulations, establishing eligibility of participants, working on budget modification, and the timing and intent of reports. This form of communication is best characterized as efforts at problem solving. While the strains of such communication were apparent for those systems in the midst of such matters, there is considerable evidence that the outcome has been a valuable one for both organizations--the staffs have had experience at working together and have shared responsibilities in the completion of joint tasks. Successful negotiation of this level of collaboration appears to have resulted in more intense collaboration in other areas, e.g., discussions on further coordination of programs, joint efforts at the recruitment of youth for programs, and the crossover of staff from one program to serve as advisors to another.

Youthwork should both encourage present forms of collaboration as well as establish incentives for the further institutionalization of inter-organization cooperation.

Regulations and reporting. In the early months of the majority of projects, many staff, especially those from educational systems, were unfamiliar with CETA regulations and reporting requirements. At site after site, project staff commented that they found CETA regulations to be ambiguous and confusing. The lack of clarity in this area was one which provided considerable tension between the two systems. The educational system staff thought CETA to be pedantic, overly bureaucratic, and more concerned with forms than with youth. The CETA personnel, on the other hand, considered school staffs to be unconcerned with orderly reporting, unwilling to press to meet deadlines and contractual obligations with regard to reports, and contemptuous of the regulations designed to prevent financial mismanagement.

Prime sponsors should be encouraged to assume a role as facilitator in interpreting DOL regulations and guidelines to program operators. This is especially critical at those sites where operators are new to the CETA system and where research and development staffs do not exist.

Youthwork should insure that in any further programmatic initiatives, project operators are thoroughly familiar with eligibility guidelines, reporting mechanisms, and other CETA regulations BEFORE the project is allowed to begin.

Youthwork should also take the initiative to reduce the amount of paperwork required of individual projects by consolidating and coordinating CETA and Youthwork forms. It should also take responsibility for informing local projects of any changes in forms, reporting requirements, or regulations before such changes are to be implemented.

Definition of exemplary status. Confusion abounded throughout the 40 sites where data has been gathered for this study as to what "exemplary status" or "demonstration project" entailed, either in the way of additional responsibilities or the waiver of same. Staff at various sites appreciated being told that they were a demonstration project, but no evidence of what that meant was forthcoming. In the absence of a clear and concise statement of what these titles would mean, many program operators have simply taken the Youthwork funds as but one more source of funding to support the programs in which they had a personal commitment.

There is no evidence available that any of the program operators have arrived at an agreement with either the educational or CETA systems that, if the project produced the employment or educational benefits expected from it and at a cost that compared favorably with that of other programs having similar objectives, the schools or CETA would agree in advance to continue the project with funds from their regular budget or from funds provided by formula from federal programs. The lack of any contrary evidence suggests that the notion that Youthwork's projects are sufficiently exemplary to warrant their continuation and expansion by their local sponsors is misplaced and erroneous. Criteria by which such judgements could be made, by whom, and when are all absent at present.

Youthwork and DOL should clarify for local program operators, before program implementation, what are the rights and responsibilities commensurate with being labeled a "demonstration project."

In addition to the factors influencing collaboration and communication enumerated above, there are others discussed in detail in the report. These include the presence or absence of a liaison person to shuttle between the local project and the representatives of both the CETA and educational systems. A person in this role appears to have had considerable impact at nine sites in terms of providing an established communication channel, steering paperwork to the correct person or committee, and serving as a buffer between continual bureaucratic demands and the day-to-day functioning of the program.

A second such factor was the presence or absence of advisory boards and councils to both provide the program with input from community and organizational representatives as well as to provide a forum where the program operators could explain their objectives and goals to a cross section of community members. The commonly shared understanding of the project and its goals by the various parties involved is yet a third factor influencing CETA/school communication and collaboration. When the different parties have different expectations and assumptions about what is to be accomplished, one or the other group is bound to be disappointed. This has lead at a number of sites to increased resistance and an unwillingness to further cooperate. *Recommendations and further analysis of these three factors are to be found in the text of the report*.

The 22 Percent Incentive

The 22 percent incentive for in-school youth is designed to stimulate continuing collaboration between the CETA and educational systems. Reactions to this federally mandated effort to increase collaboration between CETA prime sponsors and school systems were mixed. Many representatives of prime sponsors favored the 22 percent incentive and saw it as a positive step toward collaboration. But staff members of at least two prime sponsors were strongly against the tactic. In both cases their resentment was because the tactic was perceived to be arbitrary.

From the perspective of those in the educational system, the 22 percent incentive was generally welcomed because they were not forced to cooperate--the 22 percent provides incentives for cooperation rather than demands for it. However, not all education and project staff favored CETA monies. CETA monies were viewed as short-term and unpredictable. Some administrators were also wary of association with CETA fearing the taint of scandal and corruption. The need by schools for funds to carry out their programs generated ambivalence about the 22 percent monies, but once a program had begun, the pressure to maintain it resulted in a continuation of the relationship.

The actual impact of the 22 percent incentive varied. Prior to the establishment of the incentive, collaboration was limited. It was better characterized as CETA rendering services to school-age youth than real collaboration. At 11 project sites, the 22 percent incentive was not seen to have stimulated collaboration. But at 19 other locations, staff said that collaboration was promoted. Frequently, more than the 22 percent minimum was allocated for in-school programs. This is consistent with a national estimate that about twice that required amount of YETP funds are being allocated for in-school programs.

The incentive monies were used to create new services for youth, to assist schools in improving existing services and to provide services for in-school youth through non-financial agreements. From the perspectives of many CETA and project staff, the experience of working together helped inform each about the other's structure and procedures. Project staffs have adapted to CETA requirements. However, there is little evidence that carry-over from the 22 percent incentive has aided in establishing CETA/school links with the Youthwork projects per se.

> The 22 percent incentive should be retained as a means for facilitating cooperation between CETA and the educational system, but it should be reevaluated to better meet Department of Labor objectives, particularly those related to targeting provisions and incentives for program sponsors.

Duplication

The Youthwork, Inc. exemplary projects were carefully chosen to provide services not otherwise available to the target population. Interviews with local CETA prime sponsor staffs, project staffs, and school system personnel verified the effectiveness of the selection process. One important feature of the exemplary projects is the effort to integrate a range of services together in one program for a specific target group. Low staff-participant ratios, a common feature in the exemplary projects, provided an opportunity for youth to have closer and more personal relationships with project staff members. Other unique features included work experience in the private sector and academic credit for work experience.

There is evidence, however, that exemplary projects have created comptetition for available job openings for youth and also for project participants in six smaller communities. Documented consequences of this have been the inhibition of cooperation among participating agencies and poor public relations as a result of local employers being beseiged with requests for job placements.

The potential availability of both job openings and participants must be an important consideration in future funding initiatives. The Department of Labor should require prior to funding that potential program operators provide clear documentation that duplication of program and target population does not exist.

Youthwork projects should be encouraged to coordinate their efforts with other existing projects in the local area to help eliminate competition for students and job placement sites.

In summary, the Exemplary In-School Demonstration Projects have beem implemented and give evidence of accomplishing many of the goals for which they were established. This has not been without considerable inter-organization strain and tension, particularly in those instances where cooperation between CETA and a project operator was occuring for the first time. Nevertheless, programs have been implemented which are providing through in-school programs increased educational and employment training opportunities for low-income youth. The emphasis upon forging new relationships between CETA and the schools appears to have been well placed. The evidence suggests that the relations are growing stronger and that with a period of program stability, improved coordination and a willingness to consider innovative approaches will prosper.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The Exemplary In-School Demonstration Projects

The Exemplary In-School Demonstration Projects are being conducted under Title IV, Part A of the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act (YEDPA) of 1977. The projects are a set of local programs which represent an effort by the U.S. Department of Labor to explore improved means of providing employment and training opportunities for young people, particularly those from low-income, minority families. Each local program has come into being as the result of an agreement between local educational agencies and CETA prime sponsors to coordinate efforts so as to better prepare youth for the world of work.

To assist the Department of Labor and its regional offices in initiating these projects, Youthwork, Inc. was established in January, 1978. It is one of four private, non-profit, "intermediary" corporations supported by the Department of Labor from discretionary funds made available through the YEDPA legislation. Youthwork's special mandate from the Department of Labor has been to focus on the employment problems of in-school youth, on the capacities of educational and CETA systems to address these problems, and on the critical issues emerging from the evolving relationship between CETA and the schools.

The means by which Youthwork has sought to respond to this mandate has been through its involvement with the 48 Exemplary In-School Demonstration Projects. Each project, competitively selected, was to be an exemplary effort in one of four areas: (1) expanded private sector involvement, (2) job creation through youth operated projects, (3) academic credit for work experience, or (4) career information, guidance, and job seeking skills. The special focus of the projects is to be on the relation between in-school (or those who can be persuaded to return to school) youth and employment/training opportunities. The underlying rationale is one of bridging the traditional schism in United States society between school and work by developing a number of mechanisms which allow these two experiences to overlap. Rather than youth experiencing their education and work as dichotomous and unrelated, the aim is to explore innovative means by which to make them coterminous and interrelated.

The individual local programs selected for this demonstration project were slated to operate from between nine to eighteen months, i.e., between September, 1978 and March, 1980. Programs could include summer activities in 1979 if those activities were shown to be a logical extension of the school year program. They were funded from $15 million set aside by the Department of Labor for discretionary projects under the authority of the YETP legislation. The projected size of the youth populations to be served in the programs varied from a low of 35 to a high of 10,000. Sites were located across the nation in 28 states and in locations that ranged from the most rural to the largest cities. Individual grants ranged from approximately $175,000 to $400,000 with the average being near $300,000.

The period to be covered by this report--September, 1978 to May, 1979--provides a sufficient time frame within which to examine the evolving relationship between the educational and CETA systems. Of particular import is the ability to observe and document the relations which developed when projects began at different times during the academic year, the period within which almost all the projects had to operate. It may be premature here to discuss findings, but suffice it to say that the strains and tensions between the two systems were considerably less when programs began in tandem with the school year as opposed to those instances when they sought to begin six or ten weeks into a semester. For cooperative relations to exist between institutions, each needs to be aware of the bureaucratic constraints within which the other must function.

This report will not discuss program impacts upon participants. Other and separate reports issued by the Youthwork National Policy Study will undertake this assessment. The particular focus of this interim report is to examine evolving relations between the CETA and school systems and what such relations portend for future collaboration to improve employment and training opportunities for American youth.

Youthwork, Inc. and Knowledge Development

While the direct support for youth employment programs commands the bulk of YEDPA appropriations, improved knowledge is of high priority. Indeed, the Congress authorized in the legislation that up to a full 20 percent of the YEDPA funding could be used for demonstration projects seeking innovative means by which to address the problem of youth employment. The first general principle of the YEDPA Planning Charter of August, 1977, stated:

> Knowledge development is a primary aim of the new youth programs. At every decision-making level, as effort must be made to try out promising ideas, to support on-going innovation and to assess performance as rigorously as possible. Resources should be concentrated and structured so that the underlying ideas can be given a reasonable test. Hypotheses and questions should be determined at the outset, with an evaluation methodology built in.

The programmatic activities of Youthwork, Inc. are a direct response by the Department of Labor to this mandate. With Youthwork focusing on in-school youth and the manner in which the educational and CETA systems are able to contribute to the resolution of the youth unemployment problem, there has been achieved that necessary concentration of resources "so that the underlying ideas can be given a reasonable test." The Youthwork knowledge development effort has predicated its endeavor upon the following assumptions:

--More is known about the intentions of innovative youth programs than about program operations.

--More is known about program outcomes than the processes that generated such outcomes.

--More is known of the reasons for program failure than for program success.

With these assumptions explicated, Youthwork formulated four knowledge development goals, each of which sought to address the imbalance described in one or more of the assumptions listed above.

1) To identify barriers to program implementation and how to overcome them.
2) To identify unique features within programs that most help youth to achieve program objectives.
3) To examine both the degree and direction in which participating institutions have changed, and how these changes took place.
4) To assess basic assumptions underlying both the policy and practice of in-school programs in helping youth make the transition from school to work.

To achieve these goals, Youthwork structured its knowledge development activities towards data collection and analysis in three areas: the central policy question of the respective roles and responsibilities of the educational and CETA systems vis-a-vis youth employment and training; programmatic issues relating to the implementation and collaboration of approaches undertaken by projects in the four focal areas; and the local knowledge development issues unique to each program operator and community.

It is to the first of these data collection and analysis areas--the respective roles and responsibilities of the education and CETA systems in youth employment and training--that this present interim report is addressed.

CETA/School Relations: Defining the Issues

CETA and educational systems have both come to serve vital roles in addressing the issue of youth employment and training. At present, both provide programs expressed, designed, and delivered to youth who are in the process of making the transition from school to work. Yet in a period of sustained youth unemployment, it is both prudent and far-sighted to examine the possibilities of these two systems linking together so that the base of resources for youth can be broadened and the available resources better coordinated. Present conditions suggest the question is not whether there can be a partnership, but rather, how such a partnership might function. The task, from within this perspective, is one of sorting out the various strengths and potential contributions each might make. Though each system has developed its own modus operandi, collaboration can mean that target groups of youth do not confront a situation of competing claims and institutional rigidity, but one of complementary and mutual assistance.

In light of the Youthwork effort to explore the various forms of potential collaboration and cooperation between the CETA and educational systems, the Youthwork National Policy Study at Cornell University has made this a central aspect of its research effort. The analysis and data collection in this area has had three foci: the impulse and form of emergent relationships, the form and content of collaboration, and whether the Youthwork programs duplicated existing efforts by either CETA or the schools, thus calling into question the necessity of collaborative programs.

The YEDPA legislation has sought to involve low-income youth in work and/or training programs, programs jointly developed by CETA and the schools. The objective has been to provide a means by which to assist the youth in a successful transition from school to work, thus diminishing the prospects of unemployment.

To document and analyze the efficacy of the various programs, data collection efforts have had to range across a number of issues. Examples of these efforts include the following. There is the matter of target group populations and which mix of services by the two systems appears most appropriate for which specific group. A second research area focuses on the question of which system is best able to establish ties with different sectors of the community. For example, if there is to be on-the-job training, are the schools or CETA more likely to be effective in locating training positions for the enrolled youth. Again, the matter is not "either/or," but complementarity. Program characteristics are a third area and one where it is important to know which groups of youth are attracted to which programs and why they are attracted. The choices of the youth can be informative as to what programs they believe best suit their needs.

The second focus, that of the form and content of collaboration, is one which emphasizes not merely the formal and organizational structure of joint programs, but the substance of that collaboration. It is not a situation of positing either form or content to be the critical variable in program implementation, but rather both form and content. To explore these dynamics, the following are illustrative of the questions which have been investigated at the individual sites: What is the form and substance of communication between the two systems? What hinders or enhances this communication? Did the YETP 22 percent incentive prove conducive to inter-institutional collaboration?

The third focus, whether the newly created Youthwork programs duplicated already existing services to youth, is of central concern as resources are allocated to serve particular target populations. If the Youthwork effort represents a duplication, for example, then the consequences are not simply that the youth have multiple programs from which to choose. With a finite population, neither program is able to function at full capacity. Likewise, the original program cannot help but believe that its existence and rationale are being challenged; the justification for cooperation between systems is undercut; and the community may come to see reasonable programs as no more than a waste of public funds. Key areas of investigation in this third area have included the following: whether youth who belong to one training system are involved in essentially identical activities in another system; whether those who administer the CETA and school systems themselves believe that duplication does or does not exist; and in those instances when multiple delivery systems are in place, how are they administered, are the services coordinated, does coordination enhance delivery of services, and what facilitates or hinders cooperation between the systems?

For the 48 sites selected by Youthwork to serve as Exemplary In-School Demonstration Projects, they have been presented with a challenging set of problems. The sites were chosen for their potential to demonstrate effective and efficient modes of collaboration and cooperation between CETA and the schools. It has been through their implementation that actual levels of inter-institutional relationships have become evident. Further, these relations have not remained static. All parties to these exemplary programs have had to deal with a continuing set of changing conditions, changes that had the potential for severe disruptions in the provision of services to the target population of youth. It is to the credit of the CETA and school systems, as well as to the Department of Labor, and to Youthwork, that in spite of many start-up problems and the chaotic press of the first year program implementation, the preliminary findings are strong and consistent. The Exemplary In-School Demonstration Projects are bringing the two systems closer together. They provide numerous examples of coordinated programs offering education and employment training for designated groups of youth.

Having said this, it is important to stress that the findings reported in this interim report are based on the first nine of the eighteen months that the projects are slated to function. As such, this report must be taken for what it is, an interim assessment of what we understand to have been in existence until May, 1979. This report sets the context for further discussion and analysis of the interrelations between CETA and the schools and the impact of their joint efforts on behalf of in-school youth.

On This Report

The primary source of data for this report has been the materials produced by the individual on-site observers at each of the 40 reporting projects. These observers, with few exceptions, began their affiliation with the sites during the very first days of program start-up. Their field notes reflect the sensitivities which can come only from a long and in-depth involvement with their respective programs. It has been the task of the Youthwork National Policy Study staff at Cornell University to take the ethnographic notes, the materials from countless interviews, the extensive documentation, and the various numerical data as the basis for analysis of the mosaic that is the In-School Demonstration. Together with these multiple forms of field data, use has been made of the MIS data system established by Youthwork. These latter data have been particularly helpful in allowing a melding of the descriptive data with the various tabulations on number of participants, time in the program, projected target group enrollment, etc. The final thread weaving through this analysis is that of the extensive literature which has emerged with regard to CETA. While little of this literature has been formally published in journal articles or books, the number of reports, conference papers, occasional papers, and federal documents grows almost daily.

Each of the following four chapters reports on a different program area within the Youthwork initiative. A number of analyses cut across these four chapters: CETA/school collaboration and communication, the impact of the 22 percent incentive on inter-institutional relations, and whether the Youthwork programs have created duplication and redundancy in efforts to assist in-school youth.

Recommendations for both the Department of Labor and Youthwork, Inc. are located at the end of each chapter. The recommendations are emergent from and consistent with the individual programmatic focus found in the four areas. That there are differences in the recommendations across these four areas is to be expected. Indeed, it is precisely this ability to begin to differentiate which programmatic options appear to best function with varying organizational forms that marks this Interim Report as an important contribution to our understanding of "what works when and why?"

CHAPTER TWO

EXPANDED PRIVATE SECTOR INVOLVEMENT

> The deep problem affecting inner city schools are being viewed more and more as symptoms of social and economic conditions beyond the capacity of the schools alone to resolve (Institute for Educational Development, 1969, preface).

Private sector employers represent one group who can work with the educational system to assist today's youth in their transition from school to the world of work. Given that over 80 percent of all employment opportunities are currently in the private sector, it is imperative that the participation of the private sector be encouraged and increased (Graham, 1978, p.1; Pressman, 1978, p.2). Not to do so can only further exacerbate an already critical situation. Indeed, the Committee for Economic Development's research and policy committee reiterated this theme in its recent assessment of government manpower programs:

> Government programs to train and provide jobs for the hard-to-employ will continue to play an important role in national manpower policy. Its main emphasis is on the need for substantially greater private sector involvement in efforts to aid such groups both directly and in partnership with government programs (Robison, 1978, p.9).

Robison, among others had identified our youth as in need of assistance in entering the work force. This is so, he argues, as they are a group most centrally affected by the persistence and expansion of structural unemployment in our society. Robison notes:

> No more urgent economic task faces the United States than the achievement of meaningful progress toward high employment without inflation. Yet, it has become increasingly clear that there is little chance of attaining these twin goals simultaneously within a reasonable time without a greatly intensified attack on the structural unemployment problems of those groups that face special burdens which keep them out of the mainstream of the nation's work force. These are the groups that tend to experience unusually high or prolonged levels of joblessness even in relatively good times. They include, in particular, many young people, older workers, and the disadvantaged, especially blacks and other minority groups living in inner cities (Robison, 1978, p.9).

The report of the Panel on Youth of the President's Science Advisory Committee (PYPSAC) points out that in the past, educational and work institutions were almost completely distinct institutions. This panel proposed a closer connection between these two systems by adding educational functions to business organizations whereby persons within businesses would have learning, work, and teaching roles. There are distinct rewards seen resulting from this process:

> Whether the work accomplished is seen as a by-product of the development of young persons or this development is seen as a by-product of the productive experience is not important. What is important is that in such a setting both these things take place (President's Science Advisory Committee, 1972, p.161).

This process has been slow to develop in the United States due to the historical separation of school and industry. As the PYPSAC report stated:

> This mixture of school and work in a work organization is difficult to introduce in American society because schools are in the public sector, while most work is in the private sector, in firms that are subject to market competition. Without some kind of mixture between principles behind the public sector organization and the

> private sector organization confronting a market, an organizational change of the sort proposed here can hardly take place. For a firm to carry out public educational functions necessarily increases its costs and makes the firm noncompetitive in the markets where its products or services are sold. Only if the educational activities are publically supported, as they currently are in schools, can firms afford to add such functions (President's Science Advisory Committee, 1972, pp.161-162).

In an effort to address a number of the aforementioned problems, including youth unemployment, private sector involvement, and the traditional separation of school and employment organizations, Youthwork, Inc. identified expanded private sector involvement as one of its focus areas for demonstration programs. As with the other three programmatic models, this one was to:

> ...learn more about in-school programs and their effectiveness and to promote cooperation between the education and training and employment systems (Youthwork, Inc., 1978, p.2).

It was posited by Youthwork, Inc. that these efforts at linking schools with the private sector would not only provide insights into the establishment and conduct of school/private sector programs, but also provide potentially long term benefits to the participants.

> When jobs are with private employers, they contribute to important real life experiences in the labor market. Also, such jobs often last beyond the life of a project and can represent a direct, "next rung" opportunity for participants (U.S. Department of Labor, ETA, Office of Youth Programs, 1978, p.18).

The focus of this chapter, then, is the relationship between CETA and the school systems involved in the expanded private sector involvement programs.* The distinguishing characteristic of these sites is the use of private sector businesses as the source of guest lecturers, tour sites, short term (one to three weeks) vocational experiences, and most importantly, on-the-job training (lasting several weeks to several months). Though the use of the first three factors varies, each program has some form of on-the-job training.

---

*As the emphasis in this report is on CETA-LEA relationships, only limited discussion of private sector involvement per se is included.

The Youthwork, Inc. grant process of 1978 selected 12 sites for funding as private sector involvement programs. A number of the programs' characteristics are presented in Tables 1 through 3. One of the 12 sites is located in a major city with a population over one million, nine sites are in cities ranging from 50,000 to 500,000 in population and two sites are located in rural areas. The sites stretch from Maine to California and include four sites on either coast and four sites in the Midwest.

The initial plans for the twelve programs projected a range of students to be served from a low of 45 to a high of 3000. Revisions resulted in this latter figure being reduced to 500. On-the-job training in private sector placements does not exceed approximately 150 students at any program site. Less intensive involvement by students through their presence at special lectures, classroom career exploration, or other activities accounts for the high participation rate of 500 students at one project. Numerous other students who are not officially enrolled in the programs also receive program benefits when such activities as guest lectures occur within their school. The total number of students expected to receive benefits from direct participation in these 12 programs is approximately 1600 youth.

Nine sites provided data for this report. These sites have been in operation from five to eight months. Six of the reporting sites represent programs which might best be identified as offshoots of previously existing programs. The primary modification of these existing programs was the addition of specific private sector on-the-job training. Three sites instituted programs where there had formerly been none. The operators of the nine reporting sites (cf. Table 1) include four LEAs (public schools), three public non-profit organizations and two private non-profit organizations. Of the three newly established programs, as a result of Youthwork funding, one is operated by each of the organizational types above. The two rural sites which provided data are operated by a public non-profit organization and a private non-profit organization. With the exception of two public non-profit programs all of the reporting programs are conducted within facilities provided by the local school systems (cf. Table 2).

TABLE 1

Types of Organizations Operating Private Sector Programs

organizational types	reporting sites[a]	total sites[b]
LEA	4	5
public non-profit	3	3
private non-profit	2	3
government office	0	1

[a] Reporting sites are those nine which provided data for this report.

[b] The total number of sites represent all 12 funded by Youthwork, Inc.

Major activities provided at all 12 programs are listed by program in Table 3. Classroom training includes specific skills training and/or

TABLE 2

Characteristics of the Nine Participating Private Sector Sites

program[a]	operator[b]	area population range (in thousands)	where program is conducted[c]	actual/projected number of students to be served[d]		program status[e]	program began
A	LEA	50-250	school	73/140	52.1%	EEP	Oct.
B	LEA	50-250	school	100/120	74.2%	EEP	Oct.
C	LEA	50-250	school	150/200	75.0%	EEP	Nov.
D	LEA	250-500	school	352/500	70.4%	NP	Dec.
E	LEA	50-250	school	NA/150	---	NP	not avail.
F	PNP	50-250	training center	50/54	92.6%	EEP	Nov.
G	PNP	50-250	training center	80/105	76.2%	NP	Nov.
H	PNP	rural	school	45/40	112.5%	EEP	Nov.
I	PrNP	1000+	school	129/150	86.0%	EEP	Oct.
J	PrNP	rural	school	36/96	37.5%	NP	Dec.
K	PrNP	250-500	training center	23/80	28.8%	EEP	Jan.
L	GO	50-250	school	NA/50	---	EEP	Feb.

[a] Programs E, K, and L did not provide data for this report.

[b] LEA = local education agency; PNP = public non-profit; PrNP = private non-profit; GO = government office.

[c] Training centers are located at facilities owned by these public non-profit and private non-profit operators.

[d] These approximations are based upon our most recent data (April 30, 1979), but should not be construed to be official numbers. The projected number shown is also approximately the number of students each site expects to place in private sector job experiences. The exception is program D where approximately 100 students will have on-the-job training.

[e] EEP = expansion of existing program; NP = new program.

TABLE 3

Activities Provided by Program

program/ operator[a]	classroom training	career exploration	vocational exploration	on-the-job training	academic credit	community partner
A/LEA	x	x		x	x	x
B/LEA	x	x		x	x	
C/LEA	x	x	x	x	x	
D/LEA	x	x		x	x	x
E/LEA[b]	x	x	x	x	x	
F/PNP	x	x		x	x	
G/PNP	x	x		x		
H/PNP	x	x	x	x	x	
I/PrNP	x	x		x		
J/PrNP	x	x	x	x		
K/PrNP[b]	x	x		x	x	x
L/GO[b]	x	x	x	x	x	

[a] LEA = local education agency; PNP = public non-profit; PrNP = private non-profit; GO = government office.

[b] These sites did not provide information for this report.

skills which prepare students to apply for a job (i.e., filling out applications and interviewing). Career exploration includes activities which present various careers within the classroom and via lectures or tours. Vocational exploration occurs when a student is placed at a work site in an observational role or in a short term work experience. The length of this phase varies with its interpretation by program sponsors but usually it is only a couple of weeks in duration. On-the-job training occurs at every site. Academic credit is given at most sites. Three sites have attempted to acquire community partners who will participate on a one-to-one basis with program participants. These persons may be either community businessmen or retired businessmen.

The remainder of this chapter focuses upon issues pertinent to the relationship between CETA and public school service delivery systems. A concluding section contains a brief summary of each of the topics discussed and policy recommendations based upon the data presented.

FINDINGS

Factors Influencing Communication/Collaboration

The nine reporting programs acknowledged that there had existed at least some level of contact between CETA and the LEAs prior to the Youthwork, Inc. programs. Yet, as is discussed later under the topic of the 22 percent incentive, CETA prime sponsors had not previously expended funds within the school system. The communication channels which existed prior to the 22 percent incentive appear to have been oriented more toward rendering services than channels of true collaboration on programs. A prime sponsor representative from one program stated:

> Even before the YETP programs from which the guidelines came in January 1977, our youth coordinator had had informal linkages with the school district and counselors, but it was not formal. It was primarily on the service level between the youth counselors at our agencies and the counselors at the high school. But prior to the YETP we never gave the school districts any money.

Individuals from seven private sector sites (three LEAs, two public non-profit, two private non-profit) responded that channels of communication between the responding organization and government programs actually pre-dated CETA by as many as eight years. Five program personnel, each from a different site, specifically noted the Neighborhood Youth Corps as a source of prior involvement with the federal government.

Factors which enhanced or hindered communication between the CETA prime sponsor and the LEAs tended also to be the same factors influencing collaboration. Items relevant to the communication/collaboration linkage of CETA and LEAs fell into two broad categories: 1) those administrative in nature, and 2) those which reflect program philosophy.

Program Administration. Administrative issues perceived as hindrances included such items as government regulations and paperwork. A prime sponsor representative and a school administrator from one program site as well as program personnel from two other program sites noted that there existed a lack of clarity in the guidelines developed by DOL. The school administrator stated:

> The lack of definitions and clarification of process and procedures from Washington hinders communication between the two systems. The CETA prime sponsor has to interpret these for us and I think that is difficult for them most of the time. The guidelines are very ambiguous.

The amount of paperwork was identified by program personnel from four program sites as being a hindrance to the operation of their specific programs. Their plight is nicely phrased by one on-site observer:

> The principal was of the opinion that in considering changes that might be effected in future programs, any means of reducing the volume of paperwork and red tape would be helpful. His attitude, however, is one of resignation, feeling that there is little he can do to change things.

Prime sponsor representatives from seven programs all were of the opinion that communication and collaboration were quite good. Factors fostering this sense of cooperation included problem solving, monetary considerations, and regular contact via informal and formal links between the systems. Informal links were identified as primarily efforts to keep abreast of regulation changes, while formal links were seen by one prime sponsor representative to include joint efforts on RFPs, MIS data, and program monitoring. Other prime sponsor representatives and LEA officials included coordinating committees under the heading of formal linkages. Each of 16 administrative and program personnel representing all nine programs identified one or more of the above factors as enhancers to CETA/LEA cooperation.

The increasing cost of operating programs was noted by a prime sponsor representative of a LEA program as an incentive for the systems to work more closely together. He noted that schools are becoming more dependent upon CETA funds to help defray the costs of work experience programs.

> CETA is now in a position of paying a good deal of the freight for programs of this kind in the schools. The LEA is strongly oriented toward getting this money and has come to depend on it.

Further evidence of a growing reliance on CETA to help provide services for students came from an educator at another program:

> In introductory remarks, a board of education administrator indicated that the educational system needed to be "tied in with

> CETA" in order to provide acceptable services for all populations. He also expressed the view that CETA represented a "creeping encroachment" on the traditional educational system. He obviously did not think that this was bad.

The existence of or need for formal links between CETA and LEAs were discussed at five private sector program sites. Four of the reporting programs were operated by LEAs and one was operated by a public non-profit organization. Representatives of three LEAs noted forms of formal links which included committees or individual liaison persons. The public non-profit program and an LEA noted members of one system serving on committees of the other system. Individuals from two LEAs cited the need for greater strengthening of the linkage between CETA and LEAs via committees. Comments reflecting each of these positions are presented below.

At one program site coordination of the LEA operated program was facilitated by the use of an Advisory Youth Council which served to oversee and coordinate youth programs. A program coordinator explains:

> With the Youth Council being our main coordinating body, certainly different bits of information are shared through this organization. It seems to me that there is an air of cooperation. I know everybody seems to be concerned about the youth employment problem--and the best way to solve it.

Upon asking how the two systems administer their programs and facilitate coordination this respondent further described the Advisory Youth Council's functions:

> As far as administering programs and setting them up, this has to go through the coordinating council. What contributes to the ease, I would certainly think, is the mere fact that there is one body that administers and controls/coordinates all the different programs. There have been some relatively minor arguments about one point or another. If personalities did not blend together, that would be a case where the administration of programs would be difficult--if everyone thought they had a certain amount of turf to protect. But as far as I can see, the people on the coordinating council and

> the people from CETA and the schools seem to get along quite well. The people that have been in these positions have been in them quite awhile and the people running the different youth organizations have been doing this for quite awhile. They know each other well and are open with questions and exchange of information.

Linkage of CETA and the LEA at two other private sector sites, both LEA operated, is accomplished via a liaison person within the LEA operation. The liaison's responsibilities are essentially to coordinate efforts between the LEA and CETA whenever appropriate.

A prime sponsor representative from one of these programs notes that this individual is relied on for identifying the school's position on various matters.

> There tends to be a certain amount of shared decision making between Frank and me. I get input from Frank on policies as they relate to schools. Sometimes changes result from this input since the needs of schools are different than those of the adult populations we work with.

At the second program site using a liaison person, there exists an additional means of strengthening the linkage between CETA and the LEA. A school administrator noted that strengthening of the relationship, in general, has occurred because members of one system are on committees of the other system.

> Well, first of all there are formal links. The executive director of the CETA prime sponsor is a member of our advisory committee for vocational education while I am on the manpower planning council for the city. This council approves proposals submitted to the CETA prime sponsor. And last, there is one person here on the school board called the special projects coordinator with the responsibility of liaison for the entire school system to the CETA prime sponsor.

There is also evidence from another program that this crossover of staff from the two systems has taken place.

The expressed need for the coordination of program efforts via a centralized council was made by a high school principal:

> The CETA prime sponsor needs an advisory council with representatives of all the different cooperative training programs. At least then they would have a knowledge of what all of the others are doing. There would not be the misunderstandings, the hurt feelings, and the backstabbing that goes on now.

Further support for a mechanism to structurally link the two systems arose during a discussion with a prime sponsor representative from a program site which has neither a committee nor a liaison person coordinating efforts of the two systems.

> There is no centralized advisory board or council. I think we need an organization in which a person from every school district is a member and would meet on a regular basis. By such a central board we would be able to communicate services available, keep the districts current on regulations, and promote competition between districts.

There is a clear consensus among individuals representing CETA, LEAs, and the programs that there is quite good cooperation between the systems in such matters as regulations, paperwork, and other problems which arise at the private sector programs. These may often be resolved via informal means such as a phone call. The formal links fostering collaboration, such as the advisory council mentioned, are less widely used as a means to expand cooperation. Certainly the current private sector programs are evidence that the systems can collaborate to operate _a_ program. However, there exists little evidence that this occurs on a larger scale, i.e., coordination of multiple programs, at the program sites discussed above.

Program Philosophy. What might be termed misperceived program expectations or philosophies are also responsible for the current level of cooperation, between CETA and LEAs on a multiple program level, as being one of problem solving rather than one of sharing coordination efforts. The series of comments which follow are the views expressed by prime sponsor representatives, school officials and program personnel at five of the private sector programs. Four LEAs and one private non-profit program are the source of the following citations. They convey a deep-seated problem based upon distrust and misunderstandings which needs to be resolved before cooperation on a larger scale can be achieved.

A prime sponsor representative presents two problems faced by CETA:

> There is a great resistance and reluctance on the part of schools to permit outside agency involvement in the in-school programs. Also, people in general think about CETA as a handout and it is not intended to be. This implies that there is a lot of fraud connected with CETA.

From a second program site comes this comment:

> Mrs. D of the Department of Employment felt that the real value of the YEDPA project was that the educational system would learn more of the operations of the DOL, CETA, and related agencies. She emphasized that "they" would learn the importance of observing the details of legislation.

An assistant superintendent from a third site made the following two comments:

> I really think we cooperate, but if I have to point to something, you see, the school district is highly organized and it has procedures and guidelines that you must follow, whereas I don't think the prime sponsor is that well organized. They seem always to be changing.
>
> We already have a very extensive work training program at our schools. We have three cooperative work training coordinators, we have two distributive education coordinators, we have a student work and experience training program, and we have business and home service. So we have got an extensive training program. But when the youth are eligible for the CETA programs and we cannot find jobs for them elsewhere, then we utilize CETA.

A program coordinator from one site characterizes the two systems in the following manner:

> The big difference between the schools and CETA is that any time the school has some kind of program they have a "get it on" attitude. Let's get it done. Whereas some of the CETA staff are

> a little laid back probably because they have a tremendous number of things to deal with. A program like this is just one of the many they have to deal with, so they do not get going nearly as fast as the schools would like. I suppose this causes a little tension.

The program manager from the same program adds:

> One thing about the schools is that they really see programs for everyone in need, not just those economically disadvantaged. So from their standpoint, sometimes they are resistant to programs because they are earmarked for specific groups whereas the schools serve all strata so they like programs to be for all individuals.

Another prime sponsor representative identifies the following as a hindrance to better cooperation:

> The fact that both the schools and CETA have youth programs and that these programs are often competitive and that some programs offer better benefits than others, has hindered some communication and cooperation. People are protecting their turf. Just the overall opinion of CETA held by the public and by the school district has been a hindrance.

Three prime sponsor representatives, all representing LEA operated program sites, provide a different concern which has hindered cooperation. Two prime sponsor representatives from one site note:

> One school administrator told me that we provided only meaningless jobs. But the way I look at it is that any job provides experience and conditioning.
>
> The educators, a lot of them, only wanted their students placed in career oriented jobs, whereas we see the issue as immediate employment even if the job is not in a particular career field requested by the student.

The third prime sponsor representative corroborates the impressions of school personnel:

> Unfortunately, to a certain extent CETA is a numbers and placement game.

The preceeding comments suggest a need for each system to re-examine their understanding of the other system. Resolution of these conflicts, based upon perceptions of the other system, is necessary before cooperation beyond the individual program level can be achieved.

The communication and collaboration which exists within the private sector programs has been identified by persons from both systems as present and beneficial. In the case of these specific programs the collaboration has gone beyond problem solving to include joint collaboration in operating a program for youth. Perhaps these cooperative ventures will foster a greater understanding of and a broader cooperation between the two systems. As a program coordinator noted about the catalytic effect the private sector site has had in his community:

> I think this program has helped bring the operations a little closer together.

The 22 Percent Incentive

Although all of the Youthwork, Inc. programs are funded via YETP discretionary funds, the 22 percent allocation of YETP Title IV funds to in-school programs was investigated. Individuals representing the CETA prime sponsor, the school administration, and the Youthwork, Inc. private sector programs were asked about this piece of federal legislation. The specific issue investigated was whether or not the 22 percent incentive fostered greater cooperation between CETA and the school system.

Representatives of four prime sponsors provided opinions about the 22 percent incentive. Three of these individuals have LEAs operating Youthwork, Inc. programs while a public non-profit organization operates the fourth program. Additionally, one educator from a private non-profit operated programis cited. All respondents were from programs located in urban areas.

Three of the four prime sponsor representatives were convinced that this tactic had indeed fostered greater collaboration between the two systems. Indications of this shift toward greater collaboration is evidenced by both the amount of money prime sponsors are allocating to in-school programs and by the indication that there are now more joint programs than before. At one site, the representative stated the following about the 22 percent incentive:

> The 22 percent incentive was planned in October 1977 and executed in early 1978. There were no on-going programs where they worked together before that time. There is a general resistance and reluctance on the part of schools to permit outside agency involvement in the in-school programs. Since we have been working together this situation has improved greatly. Thirty-four percent of YETP funds are spent by the prime sponsor on in-school youth.

A representative from another urban program noted:

> The 22 percent incentive did enrich the interaction and created more cooperation with education. With the school's cooperation we were able to open new job sites. By being able to go in and say we are representing the county board and the school district, it provided an extra thrust. Under Title I we had 40 participants. With the inception of YETP we increased the number to 210 in two months. Also, with increased cooperation, there was more of a desire to place students in jobs related to their career choice. Of the 210 students I mentioned, 60 percent of the jobs were in line with their choice. YETP made schools aware we were here to provide a needed service.

A second respondent from this same site discussed further the extent to which the 22 percent incentive has influenced relations.

> We gave the school district 80 percent of the total YETP funds. We only allowed seven percent for administrative purposes and the remaining was directed toward participant money use. In fact, we put all the weight of the youth programs into the current school system. This arrangement, the 22 percent incentive, brought the prime sponsor and the school system together at the administrative level. This is the first time that we have talked to people at the administrative level in the school district.

A board of education member lends further support by stating that the 22 percent incentive has fostered programs which are bringing CETA, the schools, and private industry closer together.

> The YETP program is a joint enterprise which is working successfully and serving a significant number of students. There is no doubt that the 22 percent incentive system did bring education and employers together and so it is looked upon as a favorable tactic. The 22 percent incentive did not force education to work with industry, and vice versa, but it provided the opportunity and means that both had been looking for to expand training of youth through expanded work experience programs.

It is important to reiterate what two of these prime sponsor representatives stated: from situations where no prior level of cooperation existed, there has evolved, as a result of the 22 percent incentive, collaboration to the point where more than the minimal 22 percent is allocated to in-school programs. A prime sponsor representative from a third program site and a CETA/school liaison person from a fourth site also mentioned that 78 percent and 60 percent, respectively, of their Title IV funds were spent for in-school programs.

There was no indication from any of these persons that the 22 percent incentive has had any direct impact on cooperation *per se* for the current Youthwork, Inc. programs. It is not that these relations failed in this case, but rather that there was a different incentive to bring these two systems together: the collaboration was a direct result of the structure and requirements incorporated into the original Request for Proposal.

Of eight interviewed personnel (from three LEA program sites) who work directly with the private sector programs, only one program coordinator was familiar with the 22 percent incentive. His familiarity resulted from having been involved with writing proposals for federal funding. He was of the opinion that this tactic had considerably facilitated the ability of the prime sponsor to work directly with the school system. The other program personnel, unfamiliar with this incentive, had been hired to run the various programs and none had had input into the grant proposal process.

Program Duplication

The CETA perception. Prime sponsor representatives from seven private sector sites and LEA representatives from all nine program sites discussed the issue of program duplication. The prime sponsor representatives' comments were made in the context of working with four LEA, two public non-profit, and one private non-profit operated programs. Only one of the LEA programs was a new effort while the remaining six programs represented expansion of existing programs. Not a single prime sponsor representative perceived these programs as creating duplication. Inclusion of the private sector for work placements and the student clientele meeting strict CETA eligibility guidelines were identified as the two key factors making these private sector sites a new effort in the school to work transition.

Concern was expressed, however, by prime sponsor representatives from two LEAs and one public non-profit program about the competition these programs may be creating for job placements and identification of students to fill programs. One prime sponsor representative noted:

> A concern I have is that we are flooding the market with this on-the-job training business. This may be reflected in the difficulty the project is having in obtaining enough on-the-job training sites to fill their quotas.

A second prime sponsor representative responded by saying:

> All CETA programs could be consolidated. It would avoid a lot of confusion. I talked to one employer back in 1974 and he said, "What the hell is this? The government must have a lot of money to throw around." People from other programs had already talked to him about employing students.

Though entrance into the Youthwork, Inc. programs is reserved for a specific group of students, there exists the possibility of some of these students being recruited and placed in other school/work programs. A concern over the availability of students is expressed by a third prime sponsor representative.

> With the Youthwork program, we have had the problem of competition and protection of turf. We already had three programs oriented toward youth, the YETP program in the local high school, a JOY program which was established last year, and a work experience youth program. These programs are serving the same population base as the Youthwork program.

The school system perspective. Representatives of the school system at all nine programs provided interview data on the issue of program duplication. Sixteen individuals in all, representing teachers, program coordinators, principals, and superintendents were in agreement that these programs were not duplications of other programs. The inclusion of the private sector and the clientele served were the key factors distinguishing these programs from other programs.

As with the prime sponsor representatives, a concern over placement competition from these new programs was expressed by school and program personnel. One teacher stated that it seemed everyone was "knocking on businessmen's doors" looking for student placements. A program director from the same project took it one step further.

> You know, I think the main problem is, that there are too many of these cooperative programs. Everybody's trying to place kids in the business community.

A school representative stated that he would prefer to have funds used to make necessary modifications in existing programs rather than creating new ones. As an example he pointed out the problem of duplication in the following:

> If a community-based organization gets the money they can duplicate anything that the local schools have. In fact, they were recently given approval to go ahead with a program that we couldn't document a need for. We have two laboratories, each of them equipped and this community organization is duplicating a facility that, really, we do not need in this community. We already have it.

A guidance counselor from an LEA was concerned about the impact this program would have upon the vocational education program offered by the local schools.

> Mr. Tucket stated that there was one thing that concerned him about the Youthwork program; namely, a potential overlap between this program and the vocational education programs run by the Comprehensive Education Office, since both students are placed with private sector employers. However, Comprehensive Education necessitated employers paying students' wages. He wondered if Comprehensive Education would not become less desirable to employers as the Youthwork program would pay the students' wages. As a result, the vocational education students might have more difficulty being placed.

Presently, only one private sector program has been able to locate work experiences for all of the students it had planned to place in on-the-job training. Program personnel from every other site have noted the difficulty in finding placements. The experience of a teacher-coordinator from a LEA is typical:

> Many days I am out until 7 o'clock talking to people from businesses, trying to get them to place students in their businesses. My teaching is suffereing. I feel bad about that. We (the teachers) feel that it is all on our shoulders. Now that all 50 students have been placed, we have a new group--very anticlimactic. When we realize that we have to find jobs for this new group of 50, well, I just do not think it is possible.

Representatives of CETA, the LEAs, and program personnel, 23 in all, were in agreement that the emphasis and content of the Youthwork, Inc. private sector programs were not duplicating existing programs. The specific clientele served and the incorporation of the private sector were factors distinguishing these programs from others. Concern was repeatedly expressed that on a broader scale the proliferation of programs may create competition for work placements and tax the ability of CETA/LEAs to identify enough students for all of the on-going programs.

Postscript

The preceeding discussions about the communication/collaboration, the 22 percent incentive, and program duplication have often ranged beyond the Youthwork, Inc. programs *per se*. This is as it should be as the larger question has been one of locating mechanisms by which to enhance the linking of two systems. As such, the perceptions of individuals from both systems as well as the specific Youthwork, Inc. programs reflected this tendency to discuss issues on a broader level.

As for the Youthwork, Inc. programs themselves, the preceeding discussions have identified the following:

1) CETA/LEA communication and collaboration for operation of the specific Youthwork, Inc. programs have been increasingly successful.
2) Little if any carry-over effect of the 22 percent incentive was ascertained as a factor in creating a CETA/LEA or other organization cooperation in Youthwork programs.
3) The current Youthwork, Inc. programs are not seen to be duplications of existing programs. This is primarily due to the clientele served and the involvement of the private sector.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Factors Influencing Communication/Collaboration

CETA/LEA cooperation on issues relating to regulations, paperwork, or other problems were identified to be quite good by representatives of prime sponsors, school administration, and program personnel from all nine programs. Regular contact on either an informal or formal basis was seen to enhance communication. There exists a level of distrust and misunderstanding between CETA and the schools which has acted to inhibit the two systems from collaboration at a level beyond the current Youthwork, Inc. programs. Persons from five different sites identified this mistrust as a specific hindrance to better collaboration. There exists little apparent overall coordination of CETA and LEA programs at most sites. The development of a coordinating youth council at one site has fostered communication/collaboration on a broad scale. Two other sites identified individuals within the LEA who act as liaison persons in dealings with CETA.

Recommendation for DOL

DOL should mandate the creation of a committee/council within each locality whose responsibility it will be to oversee and coordinate all youth programs within that area. The committee/council should consist of representatives of the CETA prime sponsor, LEAs, CBOs, and any other organization responsible for the conduct of school to work transition programs.

Further research should be conducted to ascertain:

1) issues which have fostered the mistrust between the two systems and ways to alleviate these problems.

Recommendations for Youthwork, Inc.

Youthwork, Inc. should encourage increased contact between CETA prime sponsors and LEAs via formal linkages, such as regular face to face meetings. This increased contact may foster further joint efforts and help resolve some of the misunderstanding/distrust which exists between the two systems.

In situations where the program operator is not an LEA, Youthwork, Inc. should provide a means by which all three (CETA/LEA/program operator) can strive to coordinate their efforts.

Youthwork, Inc. should assess the impact the current programs have had on competition for students and work placements among other LEA programs (e.g., vocational education, distributive education).

Twenty-Two Percent Incentive

Individuals from both the CETA prime sponsor and the school systems who were familiar with the 22 percent incentive for fostering greater cooperation between the two systems were generally in agreement as to the efficacy of this tactic. Three of four prime sponsor representatives and three individuals from within the school system were in agreement that the 22 percent incentive had fostered greater cooperation including: 1) bringing the administrations together for the first time, 2) fostering joint program efforts, and 3) increasing access to private sector employers. The dissenting prime sponsor representative felt that too much was allocated in this mechanism. He did not, however, specifically state that the 22 percent had not fostered greater cooperation. Four sites noted that far more than the 22 percent required was being allocated to in-school programs.

Recommendation for DOL

The 22 percent incentive should be retained as a means for facilitating cooperation between CETA and the educational system.

Further investigation should be conducted to ascertain:

1) the actual percentage of funds allocated by CETA prime sponsors to the in-school programs and the reasons for their allocation decisions; and
2) the impact this incentive has had on CETA/school cooperation in comparison to programs conducted with the remaining 78 percent of YETP Title IV funds or other CETA funding.

Program Duplication

Representatives of seven prime sponsors were unanimous in their opinion that the current Youthwork, Inc. programs are not duplicating existing programs. Involvement of the private sector and the identification of a specific clientele were factors in distinguishing these programs from others. Concern was expressed by some persons that an increasing proliferation of programs may produce difficulty in both the acquisition of sutdents for programs and in the acquisition of work placement sites and the identification of enough students to fill all of the on-going programs.

Sixteen individuals representing school administration and Youthwork, Inc. program operators from all nine program sites were in agreement that the current programs are not duplicating other programs. As with the prime sponsor representatives, there was expressed concern over student and placement competition among programs. Individuals directly involved with student placement were particularly concerned about the difficulty in locating work experience sites. One school representative was of the opinion that it would be better to modify existing programs rather than create new ones.

The creation of additional youth programs, though unique in their own ways, may impact negatively upon existing programs. Coordination, adaptation, or expansion of existing programs may result in accomplishing the same outcome for which a new program is intended.

Recommendation for DOL

DOL should assess the impact that any new program in the area of in-school youth employment would have on existing programs before initiating said program.

Further research should be conducted to ascertain:

1) the number of youth employment programs operated by CETA, LEAs, CBOs, and any other organization within each CETA prime sponsor area;
2) the extent which the above programs overlap in both the clientele served and the acquisition of work experience sites;
3) a method or methods to coordinate the programs being operated for youth within an area; and
4) the advisability/feasibility of modifying or expanding existing programs rather than creating new programs.

Recommendations for Youthwork, Inc.

Youthwork, Inc. should assess the uniqueness of their programs by investigating the components of programs in existence at each site prior to the exemplary in-school program's funding. Factors indicating duplication of programs should be noted and appropriate modifications made.

Whenever possible, Youthwork, Inc. programs should coordinate their efforts with other existing programs to help eliminate competition for students and work placements.

CHAPTER THREE

JOB CREATION THROUGH YOUTH OPERATED PROJECTS

Job creation through youth operated projects was selected as a primary focus for Youthwork, Inc., because the area raised important issues in national policy toward youth. Youth are normally the consumers of programs and are not involved in the decision-making arenas. As consumers only, youth have been denied important experiences and skills which would be gained from being actively involved from the planning stage through the creation, implementation, and completion of the project. The Department of Labor and Youthwork, Inc. considered this involvement of youth the primary distinction between exemplary programs chosen for this area and programs supported under the other focal areas (private sector, career guidance and counseling, and academic credit). As the Department of Labor has noted in this regard:

> Job creation through youth operated projects has been selected as a primary area of focus because it raises crucial issues in national policy toward youth. Usually, young people are the "objects" of programs serving principally as spectators and consumers of goods and services. This passive role excludes young people from important experiences and skills. To be competent is to be the subject of an activity not the object. The measure of competence is what a person can do. Youth operated projects are a way to experiment with approaches that develop competence by actively involving the enrollee in the task of creating socially meaningful and economically gainful employment. (DOL Application Guidelines--Exemplary Programs, 1978)

The Youthwork grant process selected 12 sites for funding under the heading of youth operated projects. The sites are both rural and urban and proposed to serve anywhere from a low of 35 to a high of 300 disadvantaged youth. The total number expected to be involved in the projects was approximately 1,750 youth. Three of the projects were located in major cities with populations exceeding 1,000,000 people. Six were located in cities with populations between 100,000 and 500,000 people. Three are in cities not quite large enough to qualify as prime sponsors but with populations over 50,000 and two projects were in very remote rural areas. Each of the 12 youth operated projects are described below.

Site 1: A student operated planning, management, supervision, and personnel office.

Site 2: An alternative learning center that will provide opportunities for career education through work experience.

Site 3: Career planning and youth employment and placement service.

Site 4: Career counseling, remedial instruction in basic skills and work experience.

Site 5: Career guidance, counseling, and youth operated recycling center.

Site 6: Participants in the youth operated business will gain academic credit through several alternative schools.

Site 7: Agricultural swine production, child development and care center, construction skills, and business office skills.

Site 8: Academic credit for what young people learn through youth operated businesses.

Site 9: Academic credit for what is learned through work experience.

Site 10: Youth operated print shop and newspaper.

Site 11: Academic credit for youth operated business.

Site 12: Project provides work experiences, counseling, academic credit, for basic skills attainment through youth operated project.

Sites contributing information for this report have been in operation from two to eight months. Eight of the twelve sites provided data for this report. Of the eight projects, four are operated by school systems or alternative schools,[1] three are operated by CETA prime sponsors or a subgrantee of the prime sponsor, and one is a community based organization (CBO). Each project, with the exception of the CBO, has operated at a school facility.

The percentage of non-white enrollees at youth operated projects ranges from 42 percent to 100 percent non-white. Table 1 presents the range of non-white enrollment by type of organization.

TABLE 1

organization type	% non-white
LEA	42-80
CETA	70-85
CBO	66-88
Tribal	100

---

[1] Only one alternative school provided data for this report and for purposes of this analysis it is treated as an LEA.

FINDINGS

CETA/Schools Communication and Collaboration

Cooperation has revolved primarily around fiscal matters. CETA prime sponsors monitor the expenditure of monies by the exemplary programs operated by LEAs. When projects are located directly under CETA jurisdiction little or no interest is shown by LEAs. In the area of program content, in contrast to fiscal matters, there is much less cooperation. LEAs and CETA, as organizations, have broadly divergent philosophical positions on what "makes for a good program." CETA prime sponsors and LEA's are aware of their differences, but are hesitant to give ground.

This pattern developed at seven of the youth operated projects. In such matters as recruitment, certification, and services, there was little cooperation between CETA and LEAs. Indeed, in exploring with a school official the range of interactions with CETA, he reported:

> Our communication is largely over the terms of the grant process, budget, and requirements. The prime sponsor spoke to our project staff in the planning stages to help us understand the process. We deal on very pragmatic terms with pragmatic subjects.

A field observer contributes additional data to this point:

> If a person were to drive up to a gas station and ask for air in his tires, and the attendant came out and put air in the tires as requested, would you call that cooperation? If so, the schools and community have cooperated with the exemplary program. If your definition of cooperation requires that the gas station attendant ask where you are going, offer you a map, wipe the windshield, smile, and wish you a nice trip, then you will find that there has been little cooperation by these groups.

In seeking the best set of circumstances to assist youth, the goal should more closely resemble the second example than the first. This has not been the case. This is a comment from a local project coordinator at a CETA sponsored project.

> The school counselors tell kids a lot of things. We (the project) get a lot of kids who were rejected by school counselors. They are trying to get them out of the schools. I think schools ought to be doing more than they are. It is very hard to get answers from them.

Much of the difficulty in securing cooperation from schools and CETA prime sponsors stems from a basic dissatisfaction each organization has for the other. While the following example from an interview with a school system representative represents an extreme position, it vividly reflects the distance between the two organizations.

> When I first came into his office and sat down, the CETA director immediately launched into a tirade about the inadequacies of our educational system. "I look for a completed product," he said, "and your system is lousy." (public schools) "I have never seen a more mismanaged and bureaucratic organization than the public schools. You people are not doing your job."

Juxtaposed to these views from CETA personnel, the school systems view CETA programs as wasteful, corrupt, and of little value to the developing young person. The following summary of school system attitudes is characteristic of every site which has a strong CETA connection.

> Sure they go to work when you pick them up in a van and take them. I would like for somebody to provide transportation back and forth for me everyday, but nobody does. The unspoken statement is: "I have the moral character to go to and from work, and I do. He (the enrollee) does not and as soon as they stop toting him, he will be back on welfare." What a waste of the taxpayers' money.

Minimal cooperation (fiscal monitoring and space) has occurred at the youth operated projects but, as evident from the above statements, the underlying attitudes are not cooperative and supportive, but hostile.

Active support from schools for projects under CETA jurisdiction and active support from CETA for projects under school jurisdiction, in the beginning, would have been of great help to exemplary projects. School personnel view potential dropouts as lost causes with the fault being laid at the feet of families. The dropout rate is not seen as being related to specific actions or attitudes of the school. School project staff see the objective of school as being to prepare a person for life but they see little value in CETA programs. These programs are seen as "giveaway programs" which pamper young people rather than training them. Active cooperation by the LEAs and CETA programs could have involved: 1) identification and recruitment of potential dropouts, 2) follow-up by program and school staff to identify improvement in behavior, and 3) coordination of activities--school and work--for the benefit of the student.

As it was, three CETA prime sponsors began their association with the youth initiated projects by interpreting regulations so stringently as to inhibit any creativity project operators might have shown. This resulted in reduced flexibility which in turn increased the time needed to successfully implement the exemplary programs. An example of this occurred at five sites where there was a question as to how income produced by projects was to be used. These sites wanted to funnel the money back into the projects for capital spending or increased stipends for the youth. Two prime sponsors and one regional DOL denied this request initially but subsequently (two months later) reversed themselves and allowed this money to be spent to help sustain the project. This is but one example of how CETA regulations and DOL guidelines slowed the development of the youth operated projects. Our data indicate that now, nine months since contracts were signed, this issue has been resolved at these five sites.

Not a new complaint from organizations receiving federal support, but another factor which is detrimental to the relationship between CETA prime sponsors and LEAs is the temporary nature of program funding (Wurzburg, 1979, p. 1). School personnel look upon the programs as "one shot" efforts without continuity. They thus choose not to invest much time or energy in them. One CBO program director commented that programs funded for such a small amount (approximately $200,000.) "do not carry much weight" and therefore do not elicit much sustained commitment from either the staff or the organization.

The philosophical differences over the programmatic thrust of youth initiated projects between CETA and LEAs appear devisive. Each group is threatened by the other and finds it difficult to communicate its various needs effectively. Project staffs at local sites are not optimistic as to the degree to which the two organizations will be able to work together. As a school-based program director stated:

> It is difficult to communicate the essence of our program to the CETA staff. The two groups (LEA and CETA) have different philosophies. Well, that does not speak well for the ability of LEAs and CETA to work together, other than in some symbiotic capacity, where they (CETA) do the administrative work and the school system runs the program.

The last sentence in the comment by local staff may be a useful policy consideration in future planning of programs. By having CETA handle the administrative responsibilities, LEAs would be relieved of much of the paperwork which the Federal government requires. LEAs could then concentrate their efforts on improving the quality of the work experience and closely linking work experiences with educational experiences.

Liaison/mediator role. At four of the youth operated projects, there is a LEA-CETA liaison person.[2] This person is paid from CETA funds and is responsible to the prime sponsor. At a LEA sponsored site, this position was held by a person who was antagonistic towards the exemplary project because he had not been chosen as project director. Project staff have complained that this liaison person has steadfastly refused to help in the recruitment of youth, though he has staff and responsibility to do so. The situation was sufficiently acrimonious that the liaison person and his staff refused to hand out brochures on the exemplary project. After six months of operation, this site is only serving approximately 33 percent of the proposed target student groups (Blackstone Institute, March 1979). Commenting on this situation, the city YEDPA coordinator noted:

> There are fairly deep-seated problems that have to do with ownership of the project. The original conflict between the school-CETA liaison person, the prime sponsor, and the project director over who should control the project has caused a breakdown in the relationship between the school system and CETA. The liaison person and his staff are always telling me what they do not have to do.

In contrast, the school/CETA liaison person played a facilitative role at two other projects. These sites are serving approximately 85 percent of plan, 95 percent of plan, and 90 percent of target student groups respectively (Blackstone Institute, March 1979).

---

[2] There is no evidence to suggest that the presence of a person in this role ipso facto facilitates cooperation. Indeed, sites which do not have a liaison person have done at least as well as those sites which do.

Advisory groups. Advisory groups consisting of representatives of CETA, the LEA and other youth serving agencies were present at all three of the CETA sponsored projects and at one of four of the LEA sponsored projects. These groups have enhanced communication between the CETA and LEAs by creating a forum to discuss: 1) problems of interpretation of CETA regulations, and 2) jurisdictional issues which have arisen during the course of the project. At each of the CETA directed projects, this group has acted quickly to resolve difficulties which have faced the exemplary program. At the LEA directed site, the advisory group has had difficulty defining its purpose and this has hurt the youth operated project. The following observation at a subcommittee meeting explains the situation at this latter site more fully.

> Before the meeting was called to order, there were several issues being discussed at the conference table. One issue was brought up by a committee member (who happens to be a school board administrative assistant) and it involved whether or not he should abstain from voting on school issues. The chief manpower planner replied that he thought that the committee member could discuss the issues but not vote. The chair then said, "Well, we need to get a clarification, and particularly I would like to strike 'conflict of interest' from the previous minutes. I do believe you can discuss school programs, and vote on them. It only becomes a conflict of interest if you were personally involved in a program. We need to get clarification on these issues before we can vote as a committee. In addition, we also need to know what our full responsibilities will be."
>
> Observer comment: Once again this reinforced my belief that the committee is not fully aware of what is its purpose.

Later at the same meeting:

> Chair: "We now have to discuss the exemplary project. We have spent $75,000 on this project and I would like to know if these are expenditures or encumbrances?"

> Project administrator: "Yes, they are actually both."
>
> Chair: "Do you have the equipment in place? Has it actually been ordered and delivered?"
>
> Project administrator: "Yes. The equipment has been delivered. Actually, what is holding us up now is the renovation."
>
> Chair: "This brings to mind another question. I would like to know who actually owns this equipment. This could be a very important issue."
>
> Chief CETA planner: "Nobody knows if the schools own it or if CETA owns it at this time. If the project were to terminate, probably the Department of Labor would be the final owner."
>
> Chair: "It is difficult to make recommendations to the council without answers to these questions."

After five months of operation, this project is operating at eight percent of projected plan (Blackstone Institute, March 1979).

Twenty-two Percent Incentive

The Title IV guideline for YETP states that 22 percent of all prime sponsor monies received under Title IV must go for programs serving in-school youth. The questioning of line staff of both CETA and LEAs indicated all were unaware of this guideline. However, higher administrative personnel from both systems are informed about his requirement. From our data, the four LEAs favor the mandate as evidenced by the response of one school official:

> We support the 22 percent mandate because it promotes better cooperation and working relationships between the two organizations.

One prime sponsor, on the other hand, viewed this mandate as a misuse of federal authority:

> This was the most dictatorial application of federal funds that I have seen in a long time. You know why they did it, don't you? School boards across the nation are having problems maintaining viable training programs and generating sufficient revenue. This was a ploy to make sure that schools got training money. I (the observer) pointed out to him that it was mandated and he said, "that's true, but if things do not change in this area soon, that 22 percent will be the maximum and there is nothing to say that I cannot give it to another educational institution such as a community college."

Six other prime sponsors viewed the guideline as having no effect on their relationship with the LEA.

In conclusion, staff at the local projects were unaware of the 22 percent incentive and when informed of it stated that they felt it had little impact on their programs. Higher administrative personnel in both CETA and LEAs are aware of the requirement but view it differently. School personnel see it as a positive step in promoting cooperation between the two organizations, whereas, prime sponsors view it as having little or no effect on relations between the two groups. Eight prime sponsors have allocated during the 1979 fiscal year more than the mandated 22 percent to the school system.

Duplication of Services

A feature of the youth operated exemplary programs is that each of them attempts to combine components from other programs into one program to facilitate operation and improve services to the enrollee. The notion of service integration is familiar. The exemplary projects are putting that concept into practice. The projects combine aspects of work experience, career counseling, remedial education, and skill training. The ratio of staff to enrollees is low in comparison with other programs designed to serve in-school youth (e.g., SPEDY) and this results in intense personal contact between staff and youth. The idea is to provide the support system that a potential dropout could use to help him/her in school.

The issue of duplication of services is clearcut. The exemplary programs do offer services similar to those offered by other youth programs, but they offer more comprehensive services and the services are specifically targeted for disadvantaged in-school youth. The following from an observer's protocol is illustrative:

> At the repair shop the students all learn the same skills. The difference is that in the YEDPA project the youth are paid and eventually will go into jobs, whereas the youth in the regular program are just learning the skill. In the design group, they are again learning the same skills, but the goal is for exemplary students to put on a public display. The regular students will not do this.

Another aspect of potential duplication is the extent to which enrollees in youth operated projects were simultaneously involved in other federally funded programs. Our analysis was not restricted to CETA programs, but still we found but one example of youth being involved in two federally funded work experience programs at the same time. There were no documented instances of youth receiving pay from two federal programs at the same time.

In examining the degree to which youth operated projects were coordinated with other programs serving youth, only one site (an LEA) was found to be actively pursuing a means by which to systematically link youth programs. This idea of linkage is currently being reviewed at this site by local LEA and CETA administrators. The exemplary project would act as a diagnostic and referral agency for other youth programs. A major responsibility would be to assess the capabilities of youth before placing them into the available programs. The proven ability to provide this linkage is key to the future survival of the program in the area.

Program Operation: CETA vs. LEA

Given that there is little cooperation between LEAs and CETA prime sponsors at youth operated projects, the next question to be raised is which type of organization best serves disadvantaged youth independently of the other. Programs administered by CETA prime sponsors were more successful in implementing programs than those administered by LEAs. These CETA-run projects became operational sooner, enrolled youth more rapidly, allocated monies more quickly, and followed their proposed plan more closely than LEA-run projects. Table 2 gives the percent of proposed student target populations served by both LEA and CETA sponsored projects as of March 31, 1979.

TABLE 2

Percent of Proposed Plan by Type of Operator*

type		percent	operational since
LEA	1	19.3	December 1978
	2	137.7	November 1978
	3	8.3	December 1978
	4	33.5	September 1978
CETA:	1	94.7	January 1979
	2	62.5	October 1978
	3	86.9	October 1978

* Data not available for the CBO.

Of the four LEA-run programs, one began at the beginning of the proposed funding cycle (September 1978). The primary reason it was able to begin on time was because the school system allocated some of its own funds to start the program and was reimbursed at a later date when exemplary funds became available. Another LEA had only seven students enrolled nine months into the project and was hoping to tie into the 1979 summer SPEDY program to enlarge its population. A third had to cancel one component of the planned project as the school system removed two staff who were intimately involved with the exemplary and the project director fired a third staff member. Eventually, the project director resigned as well. As of March 1979, this project was also four to six months behind in reporting to Youthwork. The fourth project has experienced difficulty acquiring space to run its components. Two of the four components are functioning in temporary quarters and a third component is slated to become operational this summer (1979).

The one CBO which is operating had difficulty getting its plan through its Department of Labor regional office and the contract was not signed until late February/early March, 1979. It is one of the smaller (in terms of number of enrollees) of the youth operated projects and is a continuation of a project that was previously funded under YCCIP. The project has experienced several problems with staff (the project coordinator and marketing specialist left) and has had difficulty maintaining the morale and interest of the youth. Youth council meetings are held weekly and attendance by youth has been poor. As the observer notes:

> At the meeting on March 21, there were eight youth present. When they met on March 28, there were nine youth present. On April 5, there were eight youth present. This project has approximately 38 enrollees.

This organization is one of three (the other two are CETA-run) which has plans to incorporate youth into leadership roles as the project continues.

In conclusion, youth initiated programs operated by CETA produced better and more consistent results than LEA-run projects during the first six months of operation. They more closely approximate their proposed plans and had fewer problems with Department of Labor regulations. If projects are to be supported on a year-to-year contingency basis, CETA-operated projects are more appropriate vehicles.

Small Cities vs. Large Metropolitan Areas

Sites in smaller cities have functioned better than sites in larger metropolitan areas.[3] What seems to enhance the operation of the former sites is the relatively small number of people involved in the running of youth programs and the ability to use informal relationships instead of rules and regulations to accomplish objectives.

> Because Jackson City is a small place, everybody knows everybody. Several people who are involved in youth programs wear two or three hats. Therefore, you get a good line of communication. The whole atmosphere is very friendly. I think this particular project would have had problems in another setting.

Sites in small cities were quicker to begin their projects than were those in larger areas as represented in Table 3.

The three sites in our largest metropolitan areas have had the most difficulty in beginning to implement their projects. Nine months after the first contracts with Youthwork were signed, one project in a large metropolitan area still was not functioning. A second urban project began operation in March of 1979, but as of mid-June still had not contracted for an on-site observer to begin knowledge development activities. The third project has been operational since December 1978, but has been hampered by staff changes, paperwork problems, and the cancellation of one of its components.

What this suggests is a need for an expanded level of technical assistance by Youthwork staff both before and after contracts are signed at sites in large metropolitan areas. There also is a need for more comprehensive planning for projects in these areas. Solving problems at these sites takes a much longer time period and this should be taken into consideration when projects are funded.

---

[3] Small cities are defined as those with less than 100,000 people.

TABLE 3

Project Starting Dates by Size of City*

project location		starting date
small city:	1	October 1978
	2	October 1978
	3	November 1978
	4	November 1978
	5	November 1978
large city:	1	February 1979
	2	December 1978
	3	March 1979
	4	June 1979 (?)
	5	January 1979
	6	September 1978

*One project has been omitted due to lack of data.

Rural Projects

Two projects were located in rural areas. One was operated by an LEA and the other by a tribal organization. There appear to be no differences between these two and either category of the urban youth operated projects. The tribal organization experienced difficulty with the local school system. One of the outcomes has been a lawsuit filed against the local school board by the tribal organization. The exemplary project, as far as information has been made available to the on-site observer, was not the focus of the suit. The LEA-run project is currently running at 137 percent of plan in terms of the number of youth it is serving. The major problem has been the inability to come up with an acceptable (to town residents) commercial area to implement one of its four components. Negotiations have been continuing since November 1978. Many sites have been proposed but as of May 1979, none had been accepted by the school board and the local planning and zoning board.

Activities Offered at Youth Operated Projects

Of the eight youth operated projects which provided data for this report, the major activity groups are as follows:

TABLE 4

Services Offered at Youth Operated Projects

number of projects	type activity
2	peer counseling
4	work experience
1	brokerage model
1	profit making

The two projects offering peer counseling are operated by an LEA and a CETA prime sponsor. The LEA-run project is operating at approximately 10 percent of projected student involvement while the CETA-run project is operating at above 90 percent of projection (Blackstone Institute, March 1979). The LEA has been operational since December of 1978 and the CETA project since January 1979. A major difference between the two projects is the attitude of the local prime sponsor towards the exemplary program operator. The first observation is from the LEA-sponsored project and the second is from the CETA-sponsored project.

> The prime sponsor then said, "You represent the public schools (project operator) and they are not operating an efficient system. General Motors does not operate that way," he continued, "and they are cost efficient. Neither does the military. When I was in the army, we got rid of individuals that were incompetent. When a wing commander did not do his job, we kicked his ass out. We did not coddle him like a baby. This country is going to hell. The communists and socialists control the unions up North, but they are not going to get in here. I am going to run a cost-effective ship here," I asked him how he intended to do that and he replied, "CETA would be run on a solid management base." He added that he was going to create that through Title VII provisions of the act. When asked to clarify this provision, he stated, "Title VII provides for the private sector incentive program or PIC, and under this concept, a private industrial council (composed of small and big business representatives) would determine how CETA is contracted. No longer will schools get the biggest slice of the pie. CETA is going to be run like a business, that is, it is going to be profit making in that it will be cost-accountable and turn out a completed product."

And from the CETA-sponsored project:

> Mr. Prime Sponsor then gave me some impressions about the staff I was about to meet. The meeting was scheduled for 9a.m. with the exemplary supervisor and school administrators. I presented the research design and the details were discussed briefly. I felt everyone embraced my efforts with a spirit of cooperation. At the meeting's end, about one half hour later, I made arrangements to discuss all aspects of participant selection in more detail with the supervisor. While leaving, Mr. Prime Sponsor shared some observations about the interaction. Most of his comments were in keeping with my perceptions of a healthy interaction and a spirit of cooperation.

Among the work experience projects, three are LEA-run and one is CETA-run. The CETA-run program is operating at 62.5 percent of projected student involvement and the LEAs are operating at 19.3, 33.5, and 137.7 percent of plan respectively. The two programs which are running at more than 50 percent of plan are both located in cities with less than 100,000 people, whereas, both programs with less than 50 percent of plan are in cities with populations larger than 100,000. The irony of this is that in places where youth unemployment is more severely concentrated, i.e., large metropolitan areas, the programs are the least effective and efficient. The three LEAs and the CETA-sponsored program are all self-contained work experience programs. This means that the youth all work at job sites specifically created for the exemplary program.

> Enrollee supervisor: "There are some days we do hard work and they sort of complain. It is not as hard as if they were out with jobs, where they would have to really be there--come on time, and not give any lip or anything like that. They (enrollees) have so much pull in the work as far as what they can say and how far they can go. In an actual job they would not have any say. They have a little more freedom than if it were a real job. I think some of that freedom should be taken away."
>
> Observer: "You think that work sites should resemble more closely the work world?"
>
> Enrollee supervisor: "The regular work world. I feel that they should all be separated from each other and see how they function. Scramble the enrollees around. That is what finally made the support system work. They all had negative attitudes to begin with and I had to switch them around to see who could work with each other."

The use of private sector and community resources to create meaningful jobs might improve this situation. This should result in a wider, more realistic job experience for the youth.[4]

The brokerage model and profit making model are operated by a CETA prime sponsor and a CBO. These two, along with one other CETA-sponsored project, are the only projects which have plans to have youth take on leadership roles. The brokerage model site is operating at 85 percent of projected plan for serving targeted youth (Blackstone Institute, March 1979). Data for the profit making model is not available. The following is a description of the brokerage model.

> The youth are divided into 12 separate committee groups based on geographic area. Each group will perform a needs assessment of its area and then put together a proposal for funding based on the needs assessment. After the proposal is completed, it will be evaluated by a central committee composed equally of youth and adult staff. Once accepted, the youth on each of the committees will be

---

[4] The data offers no evidence either in support of or against this contention. This represents the authors' opinion.

> responsible for implementing their proposal. It is expected that many of the proposals will turn out to be small profit making businesses which will sustain themselves after the Youthwork project has officially ended. The decision as to what project will be carried out by the committees will be made by the youth themselves along with an adult advisor. Youth will be in charge and be held responsible every step of the way.

The third CETA-run project which has established a "youth operation" uses a peer counseling model. Youth act as counselors to other youth and canvass the community creating a job bank to help employ eligible youth. The peer counselors are supervised by an adult staff member, but the everyday operation of the project is in the hands of the enrollees. This particular project is operating at more than 90 percent of plan.

SUMMARY AND POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

Cooperation and collaboration between LEAs and CETA prime sponsors has been minimal. Essentially, it revolves around fiscal (CETA) and space (LEAs) concerns. CETA-sponsored programs utilize school facilities and at LEA-sponsored programs fiscal monitoring was conducted by CETA prime sponsors. Discussion of programmatic content has been hindered by philosophical differences between the two organizations and a lack of mutual trust.

Advisory groups and the school-CETA liaison role were two vehicles used to bring the organizations together. Our data does not provide evidence that the presence or absence of these vehicles was a key to the functioning of youth operated projects. The data is mixed and the more important criterion was whether the project was CETA or LEA-sponsored.

The 22 percent incentive was unanimously supported by LEA personnel familiar with the mandate. Prime sponsors viewed the incentive as having little or no effect on relations between the two organizations. One prime sponsor suggested that the 22 percent incentive was a rigid use of federal funds and as such, removed some of the flexibility he had in supporting innovative, cost effective programs. Our analysis concludes that at youth operated projects, the 22 percent incentive had little or no effect on relations between the two organizations.

Duplication of services to targeted youth was a concern at the beginning of this demonstration effort by Youthwork, Inc. The answer to the concern about duplication is clearcut. The youth-operated projects do offer services similar to those offered by other programs serving youth but, they offer more comprehensive services and the services are targeted for disadvantaged in-school youth. Service integration has been one of the strengths of the youth operated projects.

In comparing CETA-sponsored and LEA sponsored programs, CETA-sponsored programs were implemented quicker and more closely followed their proposed plan than did LEA-sponsored programs. It was suggested that if youth programs are to be funded on a year to year contingency basis that CETA-sponsored programs would provide the best results.

Sites in smaller cities were implemented more quickly than those in large metropolitan areas. Two sites in large metropolitan areas began operation six and nine months, respectively, after initial contracts were awarded by Youthwork, Inc. (September 1978). Greater technical assistance from Youthwork is necessary if these projects are to function at the same level and pace as sites in smaller cities.

Youth operated projects offered four types of program activity models. Two used a peer counseling model, four used a work experience model, one a brokerage model and one a profit making model. In comparing each activity group, CETA-sponsored programs served a higher percentage of their proposed target population than did LEA-sponsored programs. Two CETA-sponsored programs are the only youth operated projects which accurately fit the "youth operated" title. One uses a peer counseling model and the other a brokerage model.

Based on our data and analysis, the following recommendations are proposed:

Recommendations to Youthwork, Inc.

1) If youth employment programs are to be funded on a year to year contingency basis, the programs should be operated by CETA prime sponsors and not by LEAs.
2) An expanded level of technical assistance should be given by Youthwork to sites in large metropolitan areas.
3) Advisory groups and the school-CETA liaison role have shown potential for increasing cooperation between CETA prime sponsors and LEAs. These mechanisms should be investigated further to determine how useful they can be in bringing CETA and LEAs together.

Recommendations to the Department of Labor

1) The 22 percent incentive has to date had little effect on the relations between the two organizations at youth operated projects. The incentive should be re-evaluated and perhaps changed to better serve Department of Labor goals.

2) The Department of Labor should re-examine its regulations in the hope of facilitating the operation of youth employment/ training programs in large urban areas.

CHAPTER FOUR

ACADEMIC CREDIT FOR WORK EXPERIENCE

Academic credit for work experience projects was selected as one of four programmatic areas funded by Youthwork, Inc. as an innovative means to address the problems of youth employment. As a national policy concern, providing academic credit for work experience was chosen as a primary focus area because:

> Some students are so discouraged by past schooling experiences that they find it difficult to learn skills through traditional academic routes. Providing credit for work experience can be the key to encourage some of these youth to continue their education. In general, it is believed that work-education linkages can improve both the work and learning experiences. Although a number of schools in the country have programs that award credit for work, few programs successfully interrelate the education and work experiences. Schools need to take advantage of the fact that many jobs offer opportunities to stimulate learning (DOL Application Guidelines, Exemplary Programs, 1978, pp. 14-15).

The academic credit for work experience projects entail the granting of academic credit to youth for competencies acquired through career development classes, job exploration, and job placement. The projects exemplify strategies aimed at alleviating youth unemployment through cooperation between LEAs and CETA.

> It is a device that requires a high degree of cooperation between sponsors and LEAs, and it is seen as being important as an extra incentive to keep youth in an educational setting or to at least keep them in contact with the educational establishment through alternative approaches. It is also a mechanism encouraging more active participation by schools in helping youths think about the world of work and draw some kind of connection between their early work experiences and later careers (Wurzburg, 1979, p.6).

The academic credit projects are designed to help economically disadvantaged youth make the transition to the work world by providing youth with work exploration and placement in the public and private job sector. As an incentive to participate, to help them economically, and to stimulate real work experiences, they receive minimum wage payment for their job placements. Additionally, the participating youth are awarded academic credit for their participation. This second dimension is an inducement for t[illegible]rget population, potential dropouts, or dropouts to remain/return to school and matriculate toward graduation. The projects offer a gamut of services to youth: psychological, educational and vocational testing, guidance counseling, remedial education, job readiness skills, career exploration, and job placement.

Nationally, there were 12 projects funded by Youthwork, Inc. so as to examine various approaches to the provision of academic credit for work experience. Of these 12, 11 provided the data for this present report through means of a participant observer located at each project site.

The academic credit projects varied greatly although they have in common the basic feature of awarding academic credit for work exploration/experience. Three of the projects are postsecondary programs (two are community colleges, one is a state college) and involve young adults aged 18-21 years old. The remaining projects serve a 14-19 year old population. These nine projects are located in a variety of settings: two are self-contained alternative schools, two are projects located at sites other than a school building and five are located within school buildings. Two of the projects also cut across these categories, as one has five to seven high school sites and a community college site, while the other has sites at both alternative and traditional high schools. The size of the population to be served ranges from 38 to about 500 youths. Table 1 provides a summary of project site characteristics.

Not only do the projects vary in their physical location, number served, and age of population, but there are programmatic differences The projects have designed a variety of strategies for the awarding of academic credit. Learning contracts, competencies, and other means of ascertaining the experiences/skills attained by youth vary across the projects. There also are differences in the type of credit awarded, whether basic skills or work study/elective; where basic skills credit is granted, projects vary on the subject areas in which they grant credit. For the most part, the type of credit awarded is decided within the guidelines of the various state systems for awarding academic credit. Within their basic guidelines, states usually leave the rest of the responsibility for awarding credit to the local school system. At our sites, the in-school and self-contained projects have negotiated with the local LEA through school guidance counselors and principals, the alternative schools primarily with the state, and the colleges with their administration to determine the number and types of credit which can be awarded.

Job placements, although limited at all projects to 15 hours a

TABLE 1

Location and Participation Rates for Academic Credit Projects*

project	community colleges	state college	public secondary school	alternative school	self-contained project	actual/projected target population to be served 10/78 - 3/79	percent of target population served
A	3					84/75	112.0
B	1		7		1	34/86	39.5
C		1				--/65	----
D			3	2		85/291	29.2
E			1			121/166	72.9
F			4			124/75	165.3
G			1			61/100	61.0
H			1			--/60	----
I				2		67/52	128.8
J				1		103/87	118.4
K					1	--/100	----
L					1	17/38	44.7
total	4	1	17	5	3	696/970	71.8

*Data derived from MIS reports and project proposals.

week and minimum wage, can be in either the public or private sector. Private sector placement criterion (aside from federal child labor laws) is that this sector must match 50 percent of the youth's wages. All projects utilized both the public and private sector for placements, save for two in-school projects which only placed in the public sector. Four projects, three in-school and one community college in addition to paying or matching job placement wages, also pay participants for time spent in class.

FINDINGS

CETA/School Communication and Collaboration

Most of the communication between CETA and the LEAs involves an interchange between the project and the local (prime) CETA offices. Communication is both formal and informal, and usually involves determining eligibility, certifying participants and budget/fiscal matters, monitoring MIS reporting, and monthly reports. As noted by a school administrator:

> We have three budgets, Youthwork's, CETA (the city's), and the school's. It is problematic. Now that is the only formal communication. I communicate on an informal basis with the prime sponsor at CETA. The monthly reports are formal, I guess. I send those to CETA and they send them on to Youthwork and the Department of Labor. The project is responsible to Youthwork and we're responsible to CETA as subcontractors. I communicate with the project monitor at least weekly on the phone and he makes visits. He has been here several times on budget matters.

Interaction and communication between the project and the CETA prime sponsor's offices most often occurs over required reporting and paperwork. A basic dependency between the project and prime sponsor exists over the paperwork flow. One project staff person at an LEA, analyzed the situation as follows:

> Youthwork was smart in the way they set this up. The fact that the paperwork was linked between the program, the prime sponsor and the people in Washington and that no one could complete their work without the prior link having been completed each week insures that everybody has to be sensitive to the needs of one another. We could screw or jam up CETA by being three days late on paperwork.
>
> When asked by the on-site observer if the situation could be characterized as cooperation by mutual coercion, the project staff person smiled and agreed.

Initially, the reporting requirements and paperwork of both CETA and Youthwork caused all but one of the projects considerable problems. Projects did not know how to fill out the forms or even which forms were required by whom. During start-up, a learning coordinator summed up the situation as it was for the vast majority of sites, by noting:

> There is too much paperwork. The program is losing its focus as we spend hours on forms. When can we see the kids?

Only one project site circumvented this problem because the prime sponsor's office took responsibility for all paperwork.

As project staff have become familiar with the required paperwork and forms have ceased changing, communication and interaction over these matters with the prime sponsor has begun to stabilize into a regular routine. One prime sponsor noted that their "initial problems have now been straightened out and there is a good flow of paperwork."

The other areas which strained initial communication and interaction between the prime sponsors and projects have also begun to stabilize. During the first six months of operation, one project likens their relationship with CETA to crisis intervention. Complying with CETA regulations, including fiscal reporting, eligibility and participant certification procedures, entailed continuous communication and working together between CETA, projects, and schools. The relationship between these systems was strained over the project's confusion and misunderstanding of requirements and regulations.[1] By March, 1979, CETA requirements and regulations were beginning to be understood by programs funded in October, 1978, and no longer posed difficult problems. Most projects, although initially severely critical of CETA requirements, seem to be resigned to following what they consider arbitrary procedures and hence follow them begrudgedly. As one project operator noted:

> There is not really any great deal of hindrance in communication because of CETA. It is simply that there are too many people to deal with and that this arises because of the nature of federal funding going through so many government channels. These are channels that are sewed up so we go through them to keep people sweet; not because it makes any sense.

While most projects now understand and can comply with CETA regulations, the initial problems encountered between CETA and LEAs projects have left bitter memories with some project staffs and left one project, in particular, with a continued strained relationship. When the project director was asked why there were still problems with CETA she answered:

> One of the real problems is with CETA itself. It gears up real quick, gets people who do not understand CETA, gears back down and gets new people and new forms.

This project has experienced several changeovers in CETA prime sponsor contact persons and has lacked a coordinated administration of their projects. Confusion over CETA procedures and coordination of their efforts has left a noticeable strain between the school, project and CETA system.

---

[1] For a discussion of these issues, see "Research Memorandum #3: Program implementation: hindrances and obstacles," Youthwork National Policy Study, March 1979.

Eligibility. While the problem caused by reporting mechanisms and CETA compliance has stabilized, the issue of CETA eligibility requirements still impacts on the CETA/school relationship. As Wurzburg found of the YEDPA targeting provisions:

> It is an area, not cited very much in earlier reports, that poses real threats to CETA-LEA cooperation. The emphasis on serving drop-outs is not always popular with LEAs, the targeting by income is resented even more...the reasons for the unpopularity of the income cut off are predictable. Economic need is not seen as a valid or reliable indicator of employability development need. The schools, rarely having to take income criteria into account for other activities (and resenting it when they do), are unhappy with the YETP provisions. For the LEAs responsible for certifying eligibility in their programs, the task of securing appropriate evidence is an onerous one (Wurzburg, 1979, pp. 7-8).

Our analysis of the academic credit for work experience projects yielded similar results. We found that on the project and school level, staff at all projects are still unhappy about the CETA participant restrictions, particularly the income guidelines. They feel that youth's problems with staying in school are not necessarily correlated with the youth's economic background, and resent having to exclude youth who need the (academic) services the program offers. The following quotes from two project staff persons are representative:

> I believe that CETA-type programs should be available to middle-class students also as there is just as much of a problem at that level.

> This program is supposed to serve potential dropouts. They are not just low income. If it is supposed to meet this need, why is there an income level?

On the postsecondary project level these problems are amplified and take on a different nature. A project operator commented:

> At this point, we have had a hard time identifying a population that is interested in college and also qualifies under CETA. Basically, what we have found is that white middle-class students that this program is geared for do not qualify

> under CETA regulations. The kids we do attract who qualify with CETA tend to be real disadvantaged students who have dropped out of high school. This semester out of 18 students who started the program in January 1979, 15 of them do not have a high school degree. Several are at a level below our remedial college level courses. How are they doing? Not very well.

Another postsecondary institution was having trouble getting youth accepted into their project because the school would not accept youth with low Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) scores. Unfortunately, this project found that economically disadvantaged youth applicants also obtained low SAT scores. The operator at this site exclaimed:

> You just can't expect hard-core disadvantaged to meet those criteria. That's the purpose of this program--to overcome those barriers. The school is going to have to relax those conditions.

Currently, this postsecondary school's project staff and CETA offices are negotiating with the school's administrators to get the SAT restriction removed for program participants.

Another aspect of the eligibility requirement is that of the target population's age as prescribed by federal laws. These laws are difficult to interpret, are ambiguous, and limit the type of work in which youth can participate. Yet a third operator commented in this regard:

> I asked him what he thought of the federal regulations. He said that it was frustrating because there are two sets of child labor laws which apply to the youth participants at the project; one is extremely strict and limits most of the activities of the youth participants. The other set is less limiting and would allow the participants to take part in more on-site activities. The operator, of course, wants to expose the youth to as many activities as is safely possible, but he realizes that he must strictly abide by the more stringent guidelines until he is told which particular set of regulations he can use for sure.

One project modified its program to accommodate younger youth (14-15 years old) while another project solved these problems by excluding youth under 16 years old. For the three projects where federal child labor laws posed a problem and limited project services, the project staff felt these requirements impeded their ability to impact on the potentially most reachable and successful participants--14 and 15 year old youth. Although the projects' problems with the child labor laws did not directly affect relationships with CETA, it added to the annoyance with regulations and hence lowered their tolerance for regulation/interference from CETA.

CETA personnel, for the most part, did not see the eligibility criteria as having a detrimental effect on the programs' potential for effecting change. One CETA administrator put CETA's position aptly:

> Traditional schools do not know how to deal with dropouts and they do not want to deal with them. If they do not deal with them in the school system, what happens is I end up dealing with them after they have dropped out.

The eligibility criteria represent an area where the labor and education systems have divergent opinions about the nature of youth employment. CETA, as a branch of labor, perceives the problem as basically rooted in economics, whereas the school system sees the problem as indicative of learning problems which cut across the youths' economic backgrounds. As Wurzburg noted:

> The CETA-LEA conflict caused by targeting provisions is more stubborn and irreconcilable than the academic credit conflict. It is symptomatic of the divergent goals that local sponsors and local schools serve...LEAs are not in politically defensible positions if they shift large amounts of resources to serving only economically disadvantaged youth. Likewise, prime sponsors are not in a legally (nor in many cases, politically) defensible position to serve non-economically disadvantaged youth (Wurzburg, 1979, p. 8).

Demonstration status. Cooperation and communication between projects and CETA was enhanced greatly when prime sponsors helped with the administrative chores, and most importantly, were flexible in their interpretation of CETA regulations. One community college project director summed up the project's experiences:

> People's lack of knowledge about CETA laws and regulations hinders very much moving through the CETA system. Unless the CETA system wants to be flexible or wants people to know how to move through it, you cannot. They can throw so much bureaucratic red tape up that they can kill a good idea in a matter of days.

Projects perceived themselves as demonstration projects, and were often resentful of being held accountable to inflexible CETA regulations. The concern with meeting requirements on the prime sponsor's part, was felt to obscure the program's effects and outcomes, as well as being a hindrance to implementation. Another director noted:

> CETA's lack of understanding of the overall program is a primary stumbling block. Specialists coming in from CETA are only paying attention to one small aspect of the program and there is no one who understands overall what we are trying to do. The situation is a power relationship. "We don't know their regulations. They do. They don't know our program, we do."
>
> He guesses they need one another because of this, but that efforts to work together would be vastly improved if someone were to explain to the program in a unified way just what all the rules on data reporting and eligibility were, and if someone there knew overall what the program's goals were.

For projects which felt that the prime sponsor did not understand the goals of their program (these were usually the projects which had been in operation before Youthwork funding), there was an expression of desire to avoid these problems by bypassing prime sponsor and CETA regulations and reporting directly to Youthwork, Inc. This desire was expressed by projects who felt Youthwork could be more flexible and respected the project's status as exemplary and demonstrational. Since start-up and initial implementation, projects which have experienced continued administrative and reporting problems with prime sponsors have begun to appreciate Youthwork's intermediary role. A project director said:

> The greatest hindrance is that we have two very large bureaucratic structures--the school and CETA (the city). As I said, the monitor enhances it tremendously. As does having an outside person, DOL/Youthwork where we can go back to the contract or at least get another opinion if needed.

Twenty-Two Percent Incentive

Project level staff were unaware of this incentive, as were most school system personnel. CETA staff, with one exception, knew of this strategy. CETA staff were divergent on how they perceived this incentive:

> CETA Director of Manpower-- "The money was to encourage manpower to make use of existing agencies, to force manpower to negotiate with schools."
>
> Prime Sponsor-- "The primes were threatened because it was mandated and schools had the discretion of not participating."

This latter statement was reiterated at three other projects who felt they would prefer not to have the CETA money. A project director said:

> As far as the future is concerned, the only wall that is set up is the school administration has said they are not going to set up any more programs utilizing CETA funds. They feel the funds are so unpredictable and based on a different fiscal year. The schools know there has been corruption associated with CETA and they do not want people finding something wrong within their CETA school program.

Although projects cited these problems, only the one project cited above was seriously considering discontinuing CETA funds. Most projects needed the money too desperately for their program's continuation to be too critical of the CETA funds. Although critical of many of CETA's regulations and policies, one community college project director summed up his project's experience with CETA prime sponsors as follows:

> I think it has been a learning experience on both sides. We are establishing trust and good faith. In building a liaison relationship, it is in CETA's and the school's best interest. We can develop more programs. I think CETA sees it that way as does the school.

CETA administrators are also coming to similar conclusions about the systems working together; as one prime sponsor stated:

> I know the director better now, and the relationship seems more positive. We worked out early problems which were problems one often has when starting something new.

Duplication

While the CETA eligibility guidelines have created strains between LEAs and CETA, they do work to assure that there is no duplication of participants from other CETA programs. If youth are participating in one CETA program they are not eligible for other CETA programs. As a project director said:

> There is no duplication of services as the MIS form and screening takes care of that. The CETA intake person works to assure that the youth are not involved in duplicated programs.

Programmically, projects felt their unique features assured no duplication of services with any other service organization.

> Well, compared to say other programs in existence in this school, or any other county school, the fact that these kids are getting academic credit for English, social studies and math from the hours spent on the job, and the fact that they are relating to one teacher and one aide for five hours of their day is unique.

All but one project cited the awarding of academic credit as the programmatic area which was not being duplicated in their community. Where there was felt at one project to be duplication of services, it was with an education systems program. The project administrator said:

> The concept of bringing kids to college and giving them credit is new. Where we are duplicating is in the sense of providing opportunities to earn the GED.

The second most often mentioned reason by projects why there was no duplication of services in their community was their ability to place youth in the private sector.

> The only opportunity it offers is that even though our kids are employed in the public sector, we do have opportunities in the private sector which other school programs do not have the opportunity to do.

Another area which is felt to exclude duplication is in the type of participant.

> No, these kids never would have been tapped. Our program is probably the first time anybody has ever worked with them more than three days at a time.

Awarding Academic Credit for Work Experience

The academic credit for work experience projects have encountered a variety of situations and reactions from the CETA and school system in implementing the programmatic aspects of their projects. As Wurzburg found:

> The award of academic credit for career development classes and job competencies is the most visible and controversial product of the LEA-CETA cooperation (Wurzburg, 1979, p.6).

The YETP programs seek to encourage that participants receive academic credit for the competencies they gain from the work experience programs. Under YETP regulation 680.14, subpart A, section 445:

> Prime sponsors shall make appropriate efforts to encourage educational agencies and postsecondary institutions to award credit for the competencies participants gain from the program (Federal Register, March 9, 1979, p. 13192).

CETA and the prime sponsor's role in their joint venture with the education system has been limited to administrative duties and monitoring of the projects. All but one project has been left alone to negotiate with school administration and staff personnel to award credits for competencies youth acquire in their programs. Whether credits could be granted, or the type of credit granted,[2] i.e., basic skills or work study/electives, were both issues the projects had to resolve with the school system. The results of their negotiations varied, depending on the school system's level of support and commitment to the programs.

The level of the school system's commitment to the program prior to project start-up greatly influenced the school system's acceptance of the program and the awarding of credits to youth for participation in the program. As one LEA staff member who was encountering problems getting credits for participants found:

> Of the 10 students who are participating from the school, I have had trouble getting credit for two. The faculty will not release them from class. I have been back and forth arguing that they must live up to their commitment to this program, which means awarding credit to the participants. Why am I having trouble? The original proposal committed a group of people who do not want to be committed and the teachers think their courses cannot be done out of the classroom.

Commitment from the school system during the proposal process greatly enhanced the probabilities of the school system supporting the project. One of the in-school projects which has had the least problems in this area was sensitive to this issue and secured a strong commitment before implementation. The program operator commented:

> I knew we had to get many people from within the school system in agreement before we could even get the proposal out of here.

Five projects, two in-school, two postsecondary and one self-contained project have encountered problems getting commitment to the program and basic skills credit for the program participants. The school systems involved in these projects were resistant to the new programs' work experience/competency based system of granting credit. As one school administrator said:

---

[2] For a more detailed discussion of awarding academic credit for competencies acquired through work experience see U.S. DOL, The Awarding of Academic Credit Under the Youth Employment and Demonstration Act of 1977. This is a good reference on issues related to granting basic skills credit and different models for academic credit for work experience programs.

> Oh, yes, and this relates to the school's resistance to changes. Awarding academic credit for work experience is truly a new opportunity in the school and the schools have been resistant to it. A problem? Well, in communication between the school and CETA--different goals.

One project resolved the issue of the type of credit received by participants through in-school politicking and meetings which resulted in the school's eventual commitment to the program. As the principal explained the situation:

> We are doing what other school projects have wanted to do but have been unable to do. We give credit and the principals and faculty have rejected projects like that until now.
>
> The on-site observer goes on to explain how at a school principals' meeting there was heated discussion on this topic, but the principals united and now give the project full support and would like to see it expanded to all the schools.

The resolution at the two in-school projects and the self-contained project was that work study or elective credit would be received by participants:

> The principal said, "We had trouble giving biology credit, as it was considered 'unfair' to the biology department, so we give learning credit instead."

Another way a self-contained project gained commitment from the LEA was by involving the school system in the project through communication and "borrowing" teachers. The school system was excited about the program and supportive. As a school liaison person said:

> They are doing a lot of background research and basic curriculum development. I expect to send our people over to go through the materials and learn from their experiences in using materials in the classroom. It will save time and money. By helping us integrate a new curriculum into a new school, the project will have a long lasting effect on the school system.

When the school system understood the principles of the project's program, and when there was communication between the school system and the project, it was easier for the projects to grant credits, particularly in the area of basic skills. One LEA project has had trouble getting credit for their secondary school participants because of a lack of communication. As a project staff person said:

> We have been working with the guidance counselors so far and not the teachers, so they really do not understand everything about the project. Yesterday a teacher found out that a student was working at Burger King and getting credit in mass media. She hit the roof.

Except for the alternative schools, most of the communication and interaction with the school system or LEA has been between the guidance counselors and the project.

> The principal and the guidance department check each student's learning contract and approve the number of credits that the project teacher has assigned for each competency and work experience.

Often, for the in-school programs and self-contained projects, the principal is not involved in the process of granting credits for competencies. One principal summed up the relationship as follows:

> We dealt with such things as space and equipment and scheduling, what provisions we could make from the academic portion of the day. Those kinds of things, but the other off-site activities were handled strictly by the staff in the (YETP) program.

The field notes from another LEA site suggest much the same situation:

> The principal has had little contact with project staff. He talks to the director about problems and provides information when requested.

Much of the discretion then, in awarding credits for competencies acquired is left to the school's guidance department. Similar to the two in-school project's experiences mentioned earlier, a self-contained project was also not able to negotiate to get participants basic skills credits. They had to negotiate with the LEAs' guidance counselors, and lacking any lobbying power within the school system, had to settle for work study credits. The guidance counselor involved stated:

> I know they (the project) would like us very much to give other kinds of school credit other than just work study credit. They want to give math credit or English credit and we have not been willing to do that.

The six projects which have not had more than minor difficulties getting credits awarded to participants had the support at all levels of the school system bureaucracy, whereas the remaining projects, which were experiencing problems, only had the support of one or two levels of the school system. If only one sector of the school bureaucracy, e.g., guidance counselors, was committed to the program or interacting with the project, then the project had difficulty getting credit for the participants, particularly basic skills credit.

The alternative schools have not experienced any difficulties in awarding the number and type of credits they want to the participants. It is difficult to tell whether they have not had any problems granting credits because they were in existance before the YETP grant and hence had earlier worked out the potential problems, or if the state accrediting procedure is more responsive to alternative modes of education.

In total, five projects have been having trouble with the LEA/ school system in achieving the type or amount of credit they want for their program participants. From an analysis of the data, at only one project site was the prime sponsor aware of the problem and trying to negotiate with the school administration. It appears that the remaining four projects had not communicated their credit problems to the CETA prime sponsor.

Initially, these projects may not have communicated their credit/competency problems to their prime sponsors because they were so involved with the start-up problems created by confusion over regulations, reporting and late receipt of funding. As one project director stated:

> The project calls for awarding credit on the basis of competencies achieved, but due to problems in recruitment and problems with the prime, the project has only begun to enter this area. There just is not enough time, it seems, to turn around these kids, and that is what you would be trying to do. We are five months into the project and the program is not fully enrolled. Some of these enrollees have only been so for a week or so.

These projects had begun to recover from start-up and implementation problems by Spring 1979. They are now in the process of redesigning and strengthening their competencies and learning contract systems through greater formalization and specificity.

Possibly, another reason the credit issues were not communicated to the prime was because of the project's view of the prime sponsor's concerns. As an LEA program operator stated:

> For the instructional part of the program, there is no input from CETA. There has been no input because they probably do not care. They see this (credit-competencies) as a nonintegral part of the program. They see only the job training.

In several cases, the prime sponsor directly communicated to the projects that the credit/competencies issues were out of their realm. One project director said she was informed by CETA prime sponsor that:

> The CETA office told us that they are not in the business of education. They do not know how to educate. "Our business is offering training." He said they have been wanting very much to have an opening in the school system, and as far as

> he was concerned, they would help us in any way they could. But he said that, as far as he was concerned, we (LEA) should operate the program according to the way which we think will best serve the kids, because we know more about them than he does.

Although not directly involved in negotiations. several CETA primes expressed interest and concern over the granting of academic credit, with one prime sponsor in particular saying that a replicable competency/academic credit system would be the most valuable component of the program. Another CETA administrator expressed similar support:

> I am excited about it. I think it is a dynamite idea, a kid could learn math while working on someone's cash register.

Job site development. As is the case of academic credit negotiations, job site development has also been left as the responsibility of projects, who usually have a job development or site analyst on their staff. Prime sponsors are not actively involved in this aspect of the programs. Again, where projects are having difficulty finding job sites, they work on these problems internally through their job development person and Advisory/Manpower boards as opposed to seeking assistance from the prime sponsor. Projects which were operating before Youthwork funding were at an advantage as they already had job sites developed from previous years of operation. Projects do not consult CETA on job site problems because they are trying to develop sites in the private sector, the sector most projects prefer, and where CETA does not have experience or developed sites. *Private sector job sites are seen as preferable by most projects to public sector placements because they offer more unique opportunities for youth*. As a unique feature of their projects, the operators are excited about the job placement possibilities in this sector.

Two projects are involved in only making placements in the public sector. One project is probably utilizing this sector because it was easiest for them to use the sites the prime sponsor had developed and shared with them. The other project would have liked to make private sector placements, but because of the local area's tight job market, was unable to find sites. At this same project there was also conflict with the prime sponsor over public sector placements as CETA officials would not let the project develop job sites where they (CETA) were placing other CETA program participants. In this case, the relationship between CETA and the project had been strained for a long time. Work site competition was probably indicative of their inability to get along, as well as indicative of the tight job market.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Learning to understand CETA regulations, fiscal and participant reporting requirements consumed much time at the project level and created a strained relationship between CETA prime sponsors and projects during the first six months of operation. Programmatic variables such as refining competencies, learning contracts, and working with the participants was secondary to time spent on learning CETA compliance responsibilities.

Recommendations to DOL

Fiscal calendars of the school and CETA systems should match.

Eligibility guidelines, reporting mechanisms and other CETA regulations and requirements should be clearly understood BEFORE the project begins.

Recommendations to Youthwork

Paperwork should be reduced by consolidating and coordinating CETA and Youthwork, Inc. forms.

Any changes in Youthwork's or CETA's forms, reporting requirements or regulations should be clearly communicated to concerned parties before expected implementation.

The CETA income eligibility requirements have excluded many youth participants who the LEA feel could benefit from the academic credit for work experience programs. CETA primarily serves only economically disadvantaged youths, while LEAs must serve the total local youth population. Hence there is a difference of opinion between the two systems on who is, or should be, the target population. LEAs have not, in the past, used income criteria as a means of selecting youth participants for their programs and are uncomfortable in doing so for the YETP programs.

Recommendations to Youthwork, Inc. and DOL

Participant income eligibility requirements should be reexamined and made more flexible. Academic as well as economic indices should be considered in the targeting provisions.

The YETP academic credit for work experience projects perceived their exemplary and demonstrational status to mean they could be innovative and modifiable. Being held accountable to all CETA regulations and requirements made their programs inflexible and strictly structured. Project creativity was stifled and projects resented CETA for not respecting their demonstration status.

Recommendation to Youthwork, Inc.

Project and CETA staff should have clarified for them before implementation of programs what "demonstration project" and "innovative program" means and entails.

Being allowed to develop job sites in both the public and private sector was advantageous for projects. They could develop new sites in the private sector which they considered more tailored to participants' needs and innovative than public sector sites. Yet retaining the ability to place in the public sector where there were already sites developed by CETA, continued to be of highest importance. Thus programs could expand their placement opportunities all the while relying on public sector placements to provide the majority of their sites.

Recommendation to Youthwork, Inc.

Project choice of placement and job site development in the public and private sector should be retained.

Institutions of higher education have experienced problems finding income eligible youth to be served by their programs. In one situation college academic admission requirements screened out many potential participants, and in another college it was found that their school's program was not designed to serve participants' remedial education needs. Many participants lacked a high school diploma and consequently, could not take advantage of the higher education offered them. The third college has recruited only a small number of participants to serve at their higher education site.

Recommendation to Youthwork, Inc.

CETA income eligibility criteria and institutions of higher education's admission criteria should be reexamined to make the program more accessible to participants.

CHAPTER FIVE

CAREER INFORMATION

A pessimistic view emerges from studies that try to isolate career information factors involved in labor market success. Kohen and Parnes (1970) found that educational attainment _and_ labor market information influence the labor market difficulty experienced by some youth. However, they speculate that their study may really measure intelligence rather than labor market information (p.111). Bachman, O'Malley, and Johnston (1978) also state that educational attainment helps predict job success, but conclude that personal characteristics such as family background, ability, values, attitudes, and early (pre-high school) educational experiences, "...have a greater total impact on job status than does educational attainment" (p.209). These conclusions are similar to lines of argument in the Coleman, _et al_. study (1966), and the Jencks, _et al_. study (1972).

Rather than assume that luck, personal characteristics, or intelligence will determine the lot of youth, the twelve career information exemplary projects sponsored by Youthwork, Inc. propose alternative approaches to teaching youth about the world of work. The projects integrate in varying degrees new knowledge and experiences of work into that already gained from personal experiences, attitudes, and values with family, school, and community. The "application guidelines" (U.S. Department of Labor, 1978) establish a focus for the projects:

> Exemplary programs should help young people learn about their own abilities, interests, and preferences as well as providing occupational information which ranges from occupational outlook information to information about specific licensing and certification requirements, particular work environments and major tasks and responsibilities of different jobs. Such programs help youth make more realistic career plans by integrating information about job openings, job requirements, and educational and training opportunities which can help youth reach their career goals (pp.12-13).

The application guidelines stress that the projects also demonstrate "successful ways of coordinating, managing, and operating such programs" (p.13). A May 1978 knowledge development panel for this focus area sponsored by Youthwork, Inc. elaborated on the need for information about linking career guidance to the entire educational program of students as a priority for knowledge development:

> Guidance counselors will never have enough contact time with students to provide what they need. Teachers have many hours with students and can command their attention. Community facilitators of student career exposure can have high credibility. Parents generally have more time and influence with students than anyone. It is important to learn effective ways to integrate these five kinds of human resources, the career information and the school curriculum (Francis U. Macy, pp.3-4).

A basic assumption of the Youthwork effort is that the exemplary programs should be integrated into existing services.

This issue of linkages formed between the projects and the educational systems is the principal topic of this chapter. CETA's function in developing the link between the programs and the school will be explored, as will the extent to which different programmatic models are absorbed, rejected, or ignored by the educational system.

Description of Sites

Five types of educational organizations operate the career information projects:

TABLE 1

Program Operators for Career Information Projects

program operator	projects
local education agency	2
consortium	2
private non-profit	3
community college	4
prime sponsor	1

The two local education agencies (LEAs) are school districts, one in an urban city of slightly under 1,000,000 people, the other in a small city of under 75,000. The two consortia represent instances of school districts working together on the grant. One rural project joins three separate districts of under 20,000 each, while the other unites 36 districts in a metropolitan area of over 2,000,000. Two of the three non-profit organizations and one prime sponsor manage programs for school districts in population areas of over 100,000. One of the non-profit organizations serves a small city of under 50,000. The four community colleges serve metropolitan areas of over 100,000, two of which are over 1,000,000. This overview reveals that three projects operate in cities or rural areas of under 100,000, and five operate in metropolitan areas of over 1,000,000. The geographic distribution includes three projects on the east coast, three in the South and Southwest, four in the Midwest, and two in the West. Career information projects are found in 11 states.

The program activities (Table 2) offered by the operators suggests the wide variety of services within programs as well as within type of operator. Services here listed as "intensive" include career information in some form, peer counseling, and apprenticeships. Career information indicates that the youth attend a series of classes or workshops where they learn about careers, their own interests and abilities, and/or skills involved in securing that first job. such as interviewing, phoning, and dressing appropriately. The skills extend to a varying degree into related areas such as personal decision making, child care, and family counseling. It becomes increasingly difficult to categorize these activities, particularly in the case of two programs where the youth remain for the total day, because the counseling and curriculum develop as the staff becomes more aware of individual client's needs.

Five sites, including three colleges, train or will train youth to counsel their peers in the areas mentioned under career information. Nine projects feature apprenticeships, which include a wide range of on-the-job work experiences for the youth, such as peer counseling, clerical jobs for the project, as well as positions in a day care facility, a hospital, a newspaper office, or a museum.

Youth receiving intensive services are paid for their participation in the exemplary program at all but two sites. One site is an alternative school, and the other site reimburses local businessmen for their participation rather than the students. The paid youth are classified as CETA-eligible, and therefore are part of the targeted population for the projects. The target population currently receiving intensive services ranges from 21 to 103, and totals 543 students.

TABLE 2

Youth Services in Career Information Projects

operator		# of sites	Intensive Youth Services					Non-Intensive Youth Services		
			target actual*/ proposed	career info	peer counseling	apprenticeship	paid participation	target actual*/ proposed	classes	center
LEA	1	1	103/300	x		x	x	0		x
	2	1	93/130	x				0		x
consortium	1	4	21/NA	x			x	NA/1000		x
	2	3	NA/90			x		NA	x	x
prime sponsor	1	1	61/350	x	x	x	x	0		
community college	1	5	55/55	x	x	x	x	604/600		x
	2	1	0	x	x		x	0/2000		
	3	1	43/250	x			x	0		x
	4	NA	0/240	x	x	x	x	0/800		
non-profit organization	1	19	8/20	x	x		x	NA/2400	x	x
	2	1	59/50	x		x	x	0		
	3	5	100/100	x		x	x	1500/1500	x	x

*Actual target as of April 30, 1979, based on MIS data, proposals, protocols, and conversations with observers.

NA = not available.

"Non-intensive" services indicate situations where youth receive brief exposure to some type of career information, such as using a computer in a career information center to locate a possible job, browsing through pamphlets on a table in a career information center, or seeing a movie on sex-role stereotyping as part of an English class presentation. In the latter instance three sites offer career information training sessions to regular classroom teachers. Such teachers are encouraged to incorporate career information materials and ideas into their on-going curriculum.

Numbers of students receiving or intended to receive non-intensive services in Table 2 are substantially higher (N=1804) than those receiving intensive services, however, youth receiving non-intensive services are not necessarily CETA-eligible. Two sites operated by non-profit organizations encountered opposition from the school authorities when faced with filing financial forms on their students. One case resulted in anonymously numbered MIS forms for Youthwork, and the named original stored in a school vault. This will allow numbers of CETA-eligible to be checked if a court order requires it. Another site decided to approximate the percentage of CETA-eligible by the school percentage. Protocols from a third site indicate vagueness and uncertainty about the eligibility of students on the part of staff completing the forms.

Five exemplary projects base their career information operations in one public school or community college. A sixth temporarily operated in unoccupied public school space until their storefront location for job seeking skills classes became available. The remaining six projects have multiple sites. The two consortia both operate programs out of three high school , and one manages additional project activities at a teenage parenting facility housed in an elementary school. One community college and one non-profit organization both operate programs in five high schools. Another non-profit organization attempts to operate programs in schools under the supervision of 9 district superintendents. The fourth community college operates programs through six high schools, the college and two counseling centers.

FINDINGS

CETA/School Communication and Collaboration

Communication channels between the projects, the operators, and CETA vary across the 12 sites. The key actors involved in reporting, problem solving, information seeking, and contract monitoring are not in identical positions, and, in fact, the styles of communication differ according to the number of sites at the project, the location of authority for the project, and the size of the metropolitan area. Five projects (two LEAs, two consortia, and one non-profit) have had successful relationships where communication channels enhanced project implementation from the outset. These five projects initially established both a mutually clear mediating role between the project, the school system, and CETA, as well as a clear purpose of the project in relation to the school system. Of the remaining seven projects, two (community colleges) have more recently begun to resolve issues raised by unclear mediating roles. Two projects (one prime and one non-profit) have aimed at some resolution about project authority. Three projects, two operated by community colleges and one by a non-profit organization, still grapple with the relationship of the project to the schools and CETA.

Mediating roles. Interviews and observations by the on-site observers revealed that a key actor at each exemplary project plays the role of "mediator" on behalf of the project when interacting with CETA and the schools. These mediators attempt to resolve issues arising from contract monitoring, most frequently about the budget, and ambiguities surrounding CETA eligibility. They also report progress toward goals and objectives to various concerned constitutencies. The mediators occupy a variety of positions, including director of occupational education for a school district, project director, project coordinator, director of youth programs, executive director of a school, principal of a school. These positions are located in two places, either in the administrative hierarchy of the project operator, or directly at the project site.

An effective mediator for all organizational types buffers the bottleneck that DOL regulations may have on the delivery of services at the project site. He/she allows the exemplary project staff to focus attention on implementing project goals by personally intervening between the project and the other delivery systems when pressures or demands from them may interfere with day to day functioning. One mediator, also the executive director of a non-profit organization, defined his role as follows:

> With the school system, it has mainly been involvement with the superintendent of schools and the school board, to make sure that the project is attaining its original goals and objectives. There have been some problems on-going since we have received our grant,

> in terms of start-up initially and since then the development of getting other students in the project who were not directly related to the special education program. We have been able to work that out through the superintendent. With CETA, it is a direct relationship with the fiscal department, the executive director, and the youth planner, to make sure the project is meeting its goals and objectives and meeting the fiscal requirements, and also that the clients are meeting the eligibility criteria. The nitty-gritty systematic program operations are handled by the project coordinator.

Because the communication channels between the systems are operating smoothly, the project coordinator mentioned above can focus on implementing the program.

The five projects (two LEAs, two consortia, and one non-profit), that started-up by enrolling youth shortly after signing contracts with Youthwork. have mediators outside and within the project. Three mediators were among the primary writers of the proposal, and all five indicate an understanding of their project goals. One consortium and one non-profit organization are running CETA grants for the first time.

Only one of these five mediators is responsible for the day to day operations at the project. Another mediator is also director of occupational education, two are directors of projects with multiple sites, and a fifth is a coordinator hired to serve as mediator between three superintendents and CETA.

The role of one of these five mediators is described by one of the four site directors under his supervision.

> The project director/mediator has helped the job placement person in letter writing and organizing her time better. The job placement person was a very good PR person, but needed some guidance from him in these other areas. He sat right down with her and worked with her. He is always there when a problem comes up. The high school had had funding problems with various aspects of its program. Specifically, the high school had problems with the equipment for the child care center.

> They wanted to get good equipment. It was expensive equipment, and he came up with more money through a local city university in getting a grant from them. He seems to, therefore, play the role of a trouble shooter, of a liaison person who helps out with specific problems when asked.

The site director explained she dealt with the curriculum, but also this on-site observer has recorded numerous observations of instances where she counsels students about their experiences in and out of the program. The project director/mediator supports her in these activities by providing the technical assistance needed to develop and maintain the program.

The other dimension of this project director/mediator's role is the aforementioned communication with CETA. The CETA administrator with whom he communicates described the way they work together:

> Well, as far as program operation, they do it. Administration, they do it. The project director and I try to talk to each other a couple times a week. When he needs something he calls me, when I need something, I call him. Or he will call the liaison between our office and his (consortium). He will call her.

Notice that the CETA administrator mentioned the liaison person, but contact between the project and the CETA offices do not necessarily pass through her offices. One of the five project mediators also serves as the project director and principal of a small alternative school. The on-site observer reports:

> She feels in order to "get the job done" it is important to go "straight to the source" so she frequently contacts the prime sponsor directly through phone calls and letters--mostly the latter for clarification and information--so records can be more easily kept. The prime sponsor has been very helpful in explaining, clarifying, and interpreting various guidelines and regulations.

The mediating role assumed by this project director is clearly the most efficient way of handling questions on paperwork for this project as this is a smaller LEA project with one site, working within one school system. She manages the competing demands of her various roles, but does also volunteer that separate people in the roles of principal and project director would "make the program more ideal."

In two projects operated by community colleges the mediators who are also project directors find that the simultaneous demands of clearing channels between systems and implementing goals are formidable. One project director resigned because of personal frustration. The second expends total energy responding to DOL eligibilty requirements, at the cost of not having time to translate program goals to a staff who anxiously await direction. It should be noted that the project met the anticipated target requirements, but staff expressed disappointment and disillusionment with how this was done. One staff member enterred into this tirade during an advisory committee meeting:

> When I originally joined with you on this project, I was originally thinking about a pilot and exemplary project to provide career services to youth. I've got a system already set up. This stupid logging in and intake form is hurting my program of providing career services. What am I supposed to do, worry about the forms more than about the services I'm supposed to give? I've got to put up with 18 months of this Mickey Mouse stuff?

The two project directors/mediators at the community colleges were enmeshed in much larger bureautratic structures than the director/mediator of the alternative school, and consequently, they found little time for developing both system relationships and project goals. One project director indicated a lack of knowledge about project goals and a preoccupation with CETA reporting requirements in this response to an on-site observer:

> The project director then proceeded to explain that the goals and objectives hadn't been stated yet, that his first concerns

were with deadlines and quotas, and that the goals and objectives would crystalize as the project proceeded.

At the end of April the project director announced to the advisory committee that they met the projected quotas for the first DOL reporting quarter. As the meeting progressed, tension mounted between CETA representatives, the paraprofessional and five high school directors who want program direction, and the director who needs to continue meeting quotas but also wants to respond with more program direction. The on-site observer reports:

> One high school director then claimed that his paraprofessional was trying to do too much, more than she could because no one told her what her objectives were to be. A second high school director complained that there was really a lack of communication in this advisory committee, that the proposal had been written before the committee had been assembled, "there was some input, but the proposal made a fait accompli, but we don't know what it is."
>
> The project director responded, in what appeared to me to be a battle to keep his composure. "I'm giving good articulation of what our contract is all about. I want to know what your relationships and expectations are." He then explained the purpose of the program plan sheets which the paraprofessional was to use with the high school directors, to develop a project-wide statement of goals and objectives.
>
> A third high school director then applauded, saying that "Up to now the left hand doesn't know what the right hand is doing. I'm developing my own program because I don't know what you are doing.
>
> The general committee expressed agreement with that assessment, and as the mood seemed to invite complaints, the second high school director criticized the supposed link between education and the DOL, saying, "The fact that I am always detailing and documenting curtails my effectiveness. It's always a battle of the numbers. Our total effectiveness is going to be cut down."

This meeting initiated a procedure to be used for goal clarification, yet the resolutions will come slowly. The project staff responsible for working with the youth and high school directors looked for programmatic leadership from the project director/mediator, and they did not feel a sense of collective purpose.

In the five projects mentioned earlier that experienced an initially successful start-up, staff exhibited behaviors indicating a sense of purpose about the project, or understood their own goals within the one site of a multiple site project. Though some project teachers felt removed from stated project goals or, in instances when they did not know what the goals were, they were not paralyzed by this, and often formulated their own goals. The role functions of the responsive mediators at these five sites allowed them to have the time and energy to do this.

Project purpose in relation to the delivery systems. The project purpose must be clear and mutually accepted by the delivery systems. The five projects operated by the two LEAs, the two consortia of school districts, and one non-profit organization experienced no or limited resistance from the schools involved. These five projects link themselves to the existing educational systems along three dimensions: strengthening the existing services for the target youth; adding new programs using both old and new staff; adding new programs and new staff.

Four of the five projects strengthen existing services for the target population. The two consortia and one non-profit organization involve classroom high school teachers in training sessions, oriented toward helping them integrate career information into their curriculum. Teachers are reimbursed for participation in these sessions. One LEA project attempts to increase the awareness of and understanding for youth in their project by involving public school teachers, counselors, administrators, and the family and the youth employment service in discussions, both formal and informal, about progress of individuals and decisions about their future directions once their stay in the program ends.

The same four projects also add new programs to the educational services, using both former and new staff from the schools. Such programs include career information centers for one non-profit and two consortia, and an alternative LEA school. One consortium added a job counselor and a day care center to a school for pregnant and new mothers. Another consortium provides work experience for youth at the schools, using existing staff as counselors.

One non-profit, and the fifth project, an LEA, added new programs and new staff. The LEA busses high school youth to a storefront center for training in job-seeking skills, and will help them locate jobs. The non-profit provided work experience for 100 high school youth, basing their operation from the five high schools in the school district.

The various components of the five projects required different degrees of absorption into and acceptance by the existing school staff and systems. Where the school districts, community colleges, and/or CETA do not agree on the terms of the project, the project fails to be implemented, or encounters resistance which results in lengthy negotiations before anything can happen. The remaining five projects not yet discussed in the previous section on mediating roles enter this category. They are operated by one prime, two non-profit organizations and two community colleges.

Two projects, one operated by a prime sponsor, the other by a non-profit organization for high school age youth, encountered difficulty gaining access to youth and teachers as clients for their programs. A substantial amount of time has been spent on the part of the mediators trying to convince the schools that the project is worthwhile for them, and that they should participate. The authority of both operators to run the project is being actively questioned by the teachers and administrators in both school districts, and suspicion and mistrust are barriers to implementation.

A non-profit operator hoped to train teachers, but the teachers and school administrators blocked training efforts until they could negotiate the terms of the training. During the negotiations, the operator redirected its efforts toward CETA youth workers. Evidence to date indicates no clear resolution with the school teachers and administrators.

The source of low level of collaboration between the prime sponsor operator and the school district manifested itself at one meeting between the CETA youth programs administrator and a member of the board of education from the school district. The school official expressed exasperation at the amount of programmatic control exerted by the CETA official. He finally exclaimed:

> Let us as a subcontractor spell the program out and determine what is to be achieved. Give it to us and we'll deliver. It's this inter-administration thing that takes up a lot of time.

The school administrator indicates that the district would like the opportunity to administer a project designed by them, and could do it if given the chance.

Behind this inability to collaborate more freely exists a long term mistrust of CETA and government programs on the part of the board of education. One school district representative described that mistrust when refusing to sign a contract for help his system would provide CETA in a workforce survey:

> We have the capacity to get it accomplished, it doesn't have the highest priority but we'll get it through. We are most hesitant to sign a formal contract because the board of education members don't go along with the idea of involvement with CETA. It just isn't a good issue to bring before the board. The informal way is the only way we will deal with you. And you'll have to trust us. We want the information and we realize what it can do for us and the community but there is no authorization to put forth any manpower monies in getting the project accomplished. We have recently elected a board member who is really anti-government involvement, and if he got wind of this we would have a real problem on our hands. So, we won't even consider bringing a non-financial agreement, that requires the board's signature, to them.

Thus the tension continues. The board needs funds, as indicated elsewhere, and needs help with the target youth. But certain attitudes of members towards involvement in CETA programs, and a need for more control over monies to be spent caution them against involvement. And the prime needs to invest monies on in-school programs for youth, as illustrated in the 22 percent section of this report.

A resolution to this conflict occurred during late April and May, 1979. The prime sponsor will phase out their role of operating youth programs, and begin to provide technical assistance to other operators, such as the schools who secure grants.

Another non-profit organization experienced somewhat tedious decision making at the outset, but as the school districts began to trust their project's intent, and as the project began to move carefully and adhere to school district policy, the project gained their trust, and no longer had to check each decision. The project director explains the dimensions of the problem:

> The problems we have had with communication are that there are three administrators, one from the school system, one from CETA, and one from this project, that are directly involved with the decision-making process. Our problem has been the time that these three

> individuals have been able to get together. We have had more problems with directly working with the superintendent of schools, because certainly our project is only a small part of this operation and we are not an absolute priority at all times, and when we do work out a time to meet we hope to accomplish many things.
>
> He later continues: I think what has enhanced the communication has been that all three major administrators are seeing the potential long-range effects on the program and we have felt that there will have to be sacrifices in terms of time and effort to make it successful and we are very willing to cooperate. Slowly but surely, a lot of the authority in making these things have been delegated to others with a mechanism of communicating back to us on a regularly scheduled basis....

The above comments by the project director indicate a flux over time in the developing relationships and responsibilities of the key actors. Unlike the former non-profit organization and prime sponsor, this operator had secured legitimate authority for serving the needs of certain youth.

The two remaining community college operators as yet do not have youth enrolled. Both of these community colleges and one mentioned earlier underwent extensive contract negotiations with DOL before contracts could be signed. Two signed in December and one in February. One urban project has involved the board of education for the high schools, a community college, and the Department of Employment in negotiations about budgets and staff positions since the contract was signed in December. The on-site observer describes the negotiations as tedious, time consuming, and trying on everyone's patience. Not one student has been employed or received a service as of May 30. The coordinators came on board in March.

The second community college project started hiring staff in January, and has been cautiously implementing the program since that time. At the end of January the observer reported:

> The new project director noted the following progress to date: a) two new counselors hired for the project, b) two counselors transferred in from other programs without replacements, one from a handicapped program, one from the counseling and guidance department.
>
> The project director is now seeking particular project support from the dean of student services and the director of counseling as well as support from the handicapped program.
>
> He appears to be approaching project implementation in a cautious, but deliberate manner. He is obviously aware of campus politics and appears to be trying to muster a network of support without jeopardizing or threatening other elements needed in the project. This approach appears to be consistent with the prevailing Proposition 13 atmosphere on campus which is evidenced by the obvious protective attitude by all segments of the college regarding position reassignments and new programs.

Steps continued to be taken to assure the appropriate authorities in the college that the project was not duplicating existing services. At the beginning of March minority staff at the college expressed concern that an appropriate minority person be included on the project. Meanwhile, the staff was being trained. The on-site observer noted the following in-service session:

> Most of the comments made during the second half hour session focused on how to functionally and structurally make the program work. Understanding the program model was said to be essential, as well as understanding the "how to do it aspect" of the program. Points were detailed regarding lines of authority, and accountability was heavily stressed. The project director expressed that he knew there would probably be a few problems with unauthorized requisitions and that he intended to keep a close check on where the project requests were originating. He mentioned that although the start-up planning and in-service were time consuming, they were, nevertheless, essential to the success of the project. He reiterated that key project participants, particularly the core counseling staff, must understand the what, how, and why of every detail of the program.

Toward the end of March the observer noted to the project director that there were some concerns in the community and in the CETA office that actual employment ought to be taking place. The director acknowledged the concerns, adding that resistance was coming from the counseling center and the college in general because "...the project was beginning to be viewed as a 'change agent.'" For a cost-effective system, the project depends in part on practical services from the present counselors. By April the project secured help from two minority program staff on a part-time basis.

> At this point, acceptance of the project by the director of the minority program and his staff is essential for inclusion in the summer efforts of the minority program, which, in itself, is indicative of how critical and interdisciplinary effort is and will be to the project's survival and success.

After this meeting, the project was now ready to recruit 10-12 peer counselors for training, and they in turn would help 75-100 summer participants with guidance.

This narrative of one community college site helps explain the lengthy implementation process involved in integrating the exemplary program into existing services. College staff having a stake in the day-to-day operation of the project want to make it work. We can speculate that the degree of ownership experienced by the college staff may have a long range impact on changes brought to the system. But that long range integration into and impact on the system will not be measurable for several years. More immediate judgments can be made about the costs of implementation, which take into account the time involved in learning the model, the numbers of students served, and the extent of commitment on the part of the community college staff.

Twenty-Two Percent Incentive

Key actors at nine sites were asked whether the 22 percent incentive had the intended effect of bringing schools and CETA together.

The superintendent/operator for one LEA project and his prime sponsor view the CETA youth monies available as providing opportunities to create new services for youth. The prime reported that 80 percent of the YETP monies are spent on creating new programs in his schools for the target group. The on-site observer reported:

> He feels that the 22 percent incentive gave "for the first time impetus to all three public school systems for having an understanding of CETA programs for youth." Although they were aware of CETA summer programs, he doesn't think there was an awareness of the role the schools could play in the program to train and employ. CETA went to the schools and explained but at first there was not the involvement and understanding there is now. It is becoming more clear he feels, that CETA can be a natural "bridge or transition between school and work" and that the two can work well together for youth.

The superintendent of one of the districts uses such monies to run new programs for the target youth, and to change what his school can do.

Two operators, one community college and one LEA, indicated that the incentive reinforced or encouraged linkages that were already existing. An LEA administrator described this encouragement to an on-site observer:

> He (the administrator) was pretty strong in stating that prior to this working relationship with the Youthwork, CETA, and the prime sponsor, that his district had an outstanding working relationship with all of these people and that the 22 percent incentive simply reinforced this good working relationship.

Respondents from five sites, which included two consortia, one prime operator, one community college, and one not-for-profit organization, indicated that the incentive did not bring the systems together. One of the consortia is presently working with CETA through the exemplary project for the first time. The districts it represents have not had any previous involvement with the prime sponsor.

One prime sponsor who also operates programs for youth mentioned the difficulty in doing programs outside the schools because of the way he interprets the regulations for spending youth monies. On the other hand, as explained in the previous section, the school district in his area is hesitant to involve themselves in CETA programs because of their negative image. He knows that the schools need money, and he continues to entice them to take his money for certain purposes. The following quote from his presentation to a board of education representative illustrates this process:

> I'm saying that with our successful lay counselor career education program and positive reaction from all involved in the schools that you might want to take advantage of this success and help your counselors do a better job with your students. They obviously don't have the time, but we can provide with our 22 percent monies a viable program that would help students and counselors in our schools.

The key actors involved in the not-for-profit organization's project in a large urban area explained further that the 22 percent monies go to community based organizations (CBOs), and that only one high school receives money. The CETA official explained that the YETP 22 percent intended to service in-school youth works out in reality as a non-financial agreement with the schools. The CETA system in this case serves the public schools by helping keep their students who are "drop-out prone" in school by providing both work experience and a General Education Diploma. He explained the leverage that the CETA system employs by providing this non-financial agreement rather than financial for new positions, materials, or other programs.

> Observer: "What happens if it's a negotiable issue? What if school B, for example, said they would do an agreement with you? They would sign a CBO-LEA agreement but they wanted it to be financial, and they didn't want the non-financial agreement?"
>
> CETA administrator: "Well, they could do that; however, what we would do is go to our CBO where they had 25 kids in a manpower development program, 10 kids in another program and we would just tell them it just so happens that there's not room for these kids in these programs anymore."

> (The observer comments:) In other words, he was saying that, politically, it could be negotiated and that they had enough power to direct a school in the direction they wanted them to go.

This example of a non-financial agreement has implications for who staffs the programs, and for the program's impact on the schools. The schools no longer have to worry about this target group who are "taken care of" by the CBOs. Another administrator in the same system said:

> The school has to respond to the majority of the taxpayers, the majority of the representatives on the school board who are not in the most cases minority; therefore, it becomes a human nature problem in that they just can't appeal to and meet the needs of minority and low-income kids, as well as they can middle-class kids. In contrast, the General Education Diploma people are street people teaching street people. He said that CETA was succeeding in keeping kids in school, kids are getting their high school graduation requirements behind them and they're getting trained for jobs.

The question of leverage and systemic change in the schools again enters into discussion. Should use of CETA monies require that the schools change how they relate to the target population, or allow the schools to subcontract another party to take care of the target population while they continue to reach only the middle class? One LEA views the 22 percent incentive as a starting point of new programming opportunities for the target group in their system.

Duplication of Services

The Youthwork exemplary projects were to have one or more unique features not already offered in their community. This is true only if the definition of what is "unique" is accepted according to the point of view of the proposal authors. By examining their working definitions of service coordination as demonstrated by each of the exemplary projects, we have an idea of how they arrive at the point of view and its accuracy as to the lack of duplication of effort.

Service coordination. The four college operators see themselves as coordinating agencies, tapping existing resources within their system to run their project. This explains the sense of frustration over lengthy negotiations experienced by the project directors, and the delayed start-ups across the board in these projects. The frame of reference for service coordination centers on resources offered and to be developed within the colleges in two cases, and between the colleges and the high schools in two other cases.

The two consortia and three non-profit operators demonstrate styles or coordinating services for youth from several school districts. One rural consortium representing three separate school districts submitted a grant to run programs through each of their respective districts. Their one-third time project coordinator/mediator expedites federal money into their systems, and lessens the amount of paperwork for each.

The other consortium and three non-profit operators all depend on their ability to get grants that allow them to continue their programs which serve unmet needs of youth in schools. The consortium secures grants for several school districts, one non-profit organization specializes in contracts for career information programs, another tries to get contracts to bring business and the schools together, and a fourth serves the handicapped. All four have a stake in securing grants each year, and each has the resources to respond to RFPs within the short DOL deadline. As mentioned in the section on communication channels, these operator models, the consortium and non-profit organization, should secure legitimate authority to enter the schools before getting a grant. Also their position in relation to the schools requires that they be sensitive to services already offered by the system. One on-site observer of a non-profit organization's project uncovered a parallel CBO work experience program already in operation. The exemplary project did not know of its existence, and therefore was not tapping its resources.

Two LEA operators work closely with the primes. One demonstrates a high degree of coordination of services, involving parents, the Youth Employment Service, the high school and the project. The project offers a temporary stopping point for youth in trouble at school, and provides special services until the youth are ready to re-enter the other delivery systems be it employment or more schooling.

The key actors in the schools and CETA identified three dimensions for discussion of the unique features of the exemplary programs. (1) They stated that while similar programs may be available in their systems, they are not used by the CETA-eligible target group. (2) Everyone identified some program activity that was new, along the dimensions of Table 2. (3) When speaking about the program activity and when reading observations of day-to-day operations at the sites a special quality of staff-youth relationships and work emerges from the data. A current research agenda for career information on-site observers is to conduct interviews with 20 youth at each of the 12 projects about their experiences in the programs, and its impact on them.

Project Administrative Demands

> The project operator was congratulated on the lack of paperwork by everyone. He stated his office would be a conduit for the paperwork to the regional office and would try to do much of the paperwork so that the sites would not have to and could get their real work done.

Every site experienced the drain in varying degrees of filling out forms, interpreting the regulations, and then receiving a new, updated version of regulations that they must reinterpret. The project illustrated above had a project director who defined his primary role as the paperwork man for the multi-site project under his direction. To achieve a successful initiation of a program, our evidence strongly suggests that one of the key actors for each program must assume responsibility for assuring that documenting occurs, regulations are understood, monies not yet received are on the way, and ambiguities are lessened or tolerated.

The voluminous amount of paperwork contributes in part to the negative image that CETA holds for many of the operators. Operators like the monies that CETA provides, but are often reluctant to submit proposals knowing the ensuing hassles with paperwork, and reputation of some programs such as SPEDY. One suggested she may have been duped--not knowing beforehand of the bookkeeping details and changing numbers in her budget.

> My board would have dumped it a long time ago. If I knew then what I know now, I never would have begun to do it.

Part of the difficulty inherent in the paperwork management lies in the two different schedules of CETA and the schools. Schools run budgets, staff, students, and programs through a school year. Grants received in November give the schools three choices: revising the curriculum, delaying the start, or investing other funds in the start-up. In most cases programs have been delayed, save where the program clearly grew out of a previous program that was already in progress. The following case from a non-profit organization illustrates how the DOL funding schedule pressured an operator to forward fund a program that was not yet contractually agreed upon:

> She (the project operator) gave several examples of the lack of understanding that DOL had for operating with an in-school system. She said that they (the project) flatly refused to start the project in November. She said: "If we're going to start it, we're going to start it when the school year starts." Youthwork promised that they would get the money by August 30, so what she did was spend her money, the mother project's money, and did not get CETA monies until November 3. She said that this provoked tremendous amounts of anxiety which did not seem to be understood by the CETA people locally or nationally. She explained in detail the legal implications that she was liable had the CETA people not kept their word and not finally gotten the money to her. She said, "Now that you've got me on my soap box, there are tremendous communication problems. The DOL's planning schemes may work well for them but they don't work for the schools."

Releasing an RFP in May does not allow enough time for completion of proposal, the grant review, budget and goal revisions, nor for the approval process, if programs are to be implemented by schools at the beginning of the fall semester.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Assessing the impact of the "career information, guidance, and job seeking skills" projects on the service delivery of the schools to the target population is possible. One of the four college programs still in the beginning stages has carefully laid the groundwork for close collaboration and integration with the college's on-going services. The slowness in start-up allowed for possible future impact on the established services. However, not one youth was employed as of mid-April.

It is not apparent to what extent the exemplary programs at nine other projects will impact the education systems. These projects share in common a certain distance from the regular school system staff, programs, and administration. This independence comes at a cost of ownership, especially when questions about project continuation and absorption in the educational system arise. One career information team member from the work experience component at a multi-site non-profit operator project reflected on this dilemma:

> Team member: "It should be expanded for the whole year and should, I think, include all target students and it should be worked in nine week units. That way we could perhaps get an entire quarter credit for the students, treated as though it were a course for a quarter. We could provide daily instruction. In other words, these students would go to a class daily, they would work for those nine weeks and they would get a quarter credit at the end. In that class, we could cover everything with those 100 students that we now cover with our 400 students over the year. They would not miss anything; every student would have the work experience part of the program and I think it would be so much more successful."
>
> Observer: "And less messy, too."
>
> Team member: "Much less messy. We (the team) would have our own students--100 of them every quarter would come in. You would give them a job; you would give them a quarter credit and every day you would have a program you would work through."
>
> Observer: "Manage the thing."
>
> Team member: "Right. Two people can do it. ...the classes and the paperwork and the problems and placing and organizing that sort of stuff. I feel that would be the best...."

But the opportunities for her input are marginal, given that the project administrators are located several layers administratively from them, indeed a separate administration line from their school system. Other projects where the staff are temporary personnel, or teachers participated in several training sessions probably will not experience a loss if their project does not continue, and never experienced or intended to experience a real change in what they do in the schools.

In the case of two multi-site projects that provided funding for parts of on-going alternative school programs, it is impossible to determine the program impact on the education system, other than stating that new staff members strengthened the ability of the program to implement its philosophy. One teacher explained what he does as part of the career information component is not easily separated from his other activities as a teacher:

> He said that, in essence, he would like them to be able to identify with him and be able to stay in school. ...stay around long enough so that he could get some career information to them. He said he had to be extremely careful, that he isn't just outright saying, "Hey, we're going to talk about careers," he says they just turn off to very straight approaches. He said he had to go through the back door to reach them and so in essence his goal was to keep them in school, to keep them in contact, to build a relationship with them so that he could have some influence in their decision making relative to jobs and careers. One of the things that the teacher mentioned as a vehicle to build a relationship with these kids was a backpacking trip that he had just been on the past weekend. It was one overnight and two days hiking. He and two other instructors went along on the trip. He said it was a very positive experience.

Reinforcing new structures involves input from the teachers existing in the present systems. Allowing projects to reinforce the interstices where such movement is presently occurring gives such efforts a better chance of success.

New structures that set up separate but equal facilities have been declared illegal, not to mention the psychological impact such services have on the target population. Questions should be raised about two projects that offer warm, friendly environments to participants, but separate them from the mainstream, their friends, and transport them across town in cabs and busses. The programs should be seen as stop gap measures available until programs like these can be integrated into existing services available in the community.

Two projects run by one LEA and one consortium stand as examples of ecological programs, integrated into the existing community where it is located. Both are rooted in a history of needs for the unemployed, drop-out prone youth in their communities, and Youthwork offered the schools a chance to enact their ideas. The key actors are long-term school administrators, who use the project monies to tap resources in the community for their youth.

Structural facilitators for project success emerged in the form of mediators who increase cooperation and personal relationships between the delivery systems, and who lessen the negative impact of the federal paperwork. In future RFPs, Youthwork/DOL should specify the nature of the linkage between the educational system and CETA required for program models, thus enhancing increased collaboration and possible impact on the educational systems from the outset.

Recommendations to Youthwork

The utility and benefits to be derived from career information programs with non-intensive services should be re-examined. The impact of these services on the educational systems appears minimal at best and non-existent at the least.

A mediator representing the project and serving as a liaison to CETA should be identified and duties outlined in future funding initiatives.

Announcements of new program initiatives should be so timed as to eventuate in the selected projects being able to commence their activities with the beginning of either the fall or winter school semester.

With future funding initiatives involving in-school programs, Youthwork should carefully ascertain the level of involvement by educational staff, as well as their acceptance of the goals of the project.

Recommendations to the Department of Labor

Prime sponsors should be encouraged to assume a role as facilitator in interpreting DOL regulations and guidelines for the operators, thereby making CETA more accessible to sites without research and development staff. It should be noted that two LEAs, one non-profit, and two consortia who had successful start-ups use the CETA prime sponsor in this capacity.

As a means to more effectively target resources and strengthen the opportunities for effecting change within school systems, the DOL should consider funding on-going intensive career information as opposed to new programs.

REFERENCES

Bachman, Jerald, Patrick O'Malley, and Jerome Johnston
1978 Youth in Transition: Volume VI, Change and Stability in the Lives of Young Men. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research.

Coleman, James S., et al.
1972 Youth: Transition to Adulthood. Report of the Panel on Youth of the President's Science Advisory Committee. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Coleman, James S., Ernest Q. Campbell, et al.
1966 Equality of Educational Opportunity. Washington, D.C.: Office of Education.

Graham, Richard A.
1978 "Private sector employment projects for youth." Youthwork, Inc. (unpublished paper)

Institute for Educational Development
1969 "Partnership high schools: the search for new ways to cooperate." ERIC document, ED039273.

Jencks, Christopher, Marshall Smith, Henry Acland, Mary Jo Bane, David Cohen, Herbert Gintis, Barbara Heyns, and Stephen Michelson
1972 Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effects of Family and Schooling in America. New York: Basic Books.

Kohen, Andrew I., and Herbert S. Parnes
1970 Career Thresholds: Volume III, A Longitudinal Study of the Educational and Labor Market Experience of Male Youth. Columbus, Ohio: Center for Human Resource Research, the Ohio State University, May.

Macy, Francis U.
1978 "Recommendations of the knowledge development panel on career information guidance and job seeking skills." Youthwork, Inc. (unpublished manuscript)

Pressman, Harvey
1978 "Expending private sector involvement in youth employment programs: what we need to learn, why we need to learn it." Youthwork, Inc. (unpublished paper)

Robison, David
1978 Training and Jobs Programs in Action: Case Studies in Private Sector Initiatives for the Hard to Employ. Committee for Economic Development/Work in America Institute, Inc.

U.S. Department of Labor
1977 "The awarding of academic credit under the Youth Employment and Demonstration Act of 1977." Employment and Training Administration, Office of Youth Programs.

U.S. Department of Labor
1978 "Exemplary in-school youth programs demonstration project: application guidelines." Employment and Training Administration, Office of Youth Programs, April 6.

U.S. Department of Labor
1979 Federal Register, Part II. Employment and Training Administration, Office of Youth Programs, March 9.

Wurzburg, G.
1979 Overview of Local Focus on Youth. National Council on Employment Policy, February 28.

Youthwork, Inc.
1978 "Youthwork knowledge development plan."

Youthwork National Policy Study
1979 "Research Memorandum #3: Program implementation, hindrances and obstacles," March 20.

Methodological Appendix

Introduction

To learn more about the complex set of relations between education and present/future employment opportunities, the Department of Labor set aside from YETP discretionary funds approximately 15 million dollars for "Exemplary In-School Demonstration Projects." These grants were to explore the dynamics of in school projects and their effectiveness. They also would be awarded to promote cooperation between the education and employment and training service systems.

To assist the Department of Labor and its regional offices in undertaking this effort, Youthwork, Inc., an intermediary non-profit corporation, was established in January, 1978. Youthwork's responsibilities were to include: developing guidelines for the competition to select the Exemplary In-School Demonstration Projects, reviewing submitted proposals, making recommendations for funding, providing guidance and technical assistance for those projects selected in the competition, developing and implementing a knowledge development plan so as to increase understanding of different approaches and their effectiveness, and forwarding reports and recommendations to the Department of Labor.

As a result of a five tier evaluation process designed to select from among the more than 520 submitted proposals, Youthwork made its recommendations to the Department of Labor. Forty-eight projects were chosen. The first contracts were signed and projects began operation in September, 1978. Forty-seven of the original 48 projects are now

(July, 1979) operational.

To assess these projects and their efficacy in achieving the twin goals of program effectiveness and inter-institutional collaboration, Youthwork undertook a number of knowledge development efforts. These were to include the use of analystic ethnographic material collected by a trained observer placed at each project, third party evaluators, MIS systems, and self study reports from the individual projects.

For the first of these efforts, that of developing a cross-site comparative framework employing qualitative data collection strategies, Youthwork, Inc., selected in September 1978 a group of researchers at the College of Human Ecology, Cornell University. The Cornell project, entitled "Youthwork National Policy Study," has undertaken a longitudinal case study research program. Trained observers at each of the project sites have been gathering data in specified areas designated and developed by mutual agreement of the Department of Labor, Youthwork, and the Cornell University research team. Forging New Relationships: The CETA/School Nexus is the first of a number of interim reports to be presented by the Youthwork National Policy Study.

This methodological appendix has been prepared in order to explicate the research methodology used in writing this report and others to follow. The key points to be reviewed are the theoretical and empirical rationale for qualitative research, the general research plan, the focus for the first interim report, and strengths and limitations of the data. The hope of the Cornell Staff is that this appendix will help expand the reader's understanding of this research effort.

I. Theoretical Rationale

Many labels have been attached to the research strategy of direct observation of human activity and interaction in a naturalistic environment. One of the earliest uses of this technique was by anthropologists in their field studies of pre-literate peoples. Malinowski (1922) labeled his technique of observation and participation in the various activities of a Trobriand village as "ethnography." He described his goal in utilizing this technique as follows:

> The field ethnographer has seriously and soberly to cover the full extent of the phenomena in each aspect of tribal culture studies, making no difference between what is commonplace or drab, or ordinary, and what strikes him as astonishing and out of the way. At the same time, the whole area of tribal culture, in all its aspects, has to be gone over in research. The consistency, the law and order which obtain within each aspect make also for joining them into one coherent whole.

More recently, Valentine (1968) has called for new ethnographic research to be conducted among various groups of North American urban poor. He states it will be only in this fashion that the actual motivations and desires of the poor will become known. Only through direct participation in the life of those being studied will there emerge an understanding of the structure of the society in which they live. Valentine contends just as provincial judgments were made by colonialists concerning the peoples they encountered, so also provincial judgments are presently being made about the poor by middle-class social scientists. The provincialism must be overcome by sustained contact which leads to acceptance and understanding of the internal logic of the group being studied. Valentine notes (1968: 8-9):

> It (ethnography) requires that the ethnographer live with the people whose culture he studies. From the time of pioneer field workers onward, it has been recognized that prolonged, intensive, direct exposure to the actual conditions of life is needed to understand a previously unknown culture. This involves direct observation of social behavior and participation in community life as well as systematic questioning and discussion with informants. Only by this immersion in on-going group existence can the anthropologist probe thoroughly beneath the surface of a culture and replace superficial impressions with more accurate insights.

Sociologists have utilized nonparticipant observation for such diverse studies as industrial strikes (Gouldner, 1954); community organization (Hatch, 1948; Lynd and Lynd, 1928; Warner et al., 1944); behavior in public places (Goffman, 1963); psychiatric interviewing (Scheff, 1966); clientele in stores with pornographic material (Polsky, 1967); controlled studies involved with attitude formation (Katz, 1957); effects of group pressure on the modification and distortion of judgments (Asch, 1952); and development of racial identification (Clark, 1947; Goodman, 1952). The settings in which such observations occur vary from the naturalistic setting of the union hall or bookstore to the highly structured surroundings of the laboratory.

Examples in the sociological literature of studies utilizing participant observation include Whyte (1943) in his study of "Cornerville;" Liebow (1967) with black streetcorner men; Becker (1955) with jazz musicians; Henslin (1967) with cab drivers; and Humphreys (1970) who participated as a voyeur for men engaged in homosexual activity in public restrooms. Within the field of education, both participant and nonparticipant observation have been employed in the study of classroom activities and interactions. Bellack (1966), Biddle and Adams (1967), Henry (1963), Rist, (1970, 1973, 1978), Smith and Geoffrey (1968), all have utilized direct observation of classroom situations to analyze attitude formation, peer group relations, student teacher training, and variations in teacher control techniques. In the employment field, Wurzburg (1978, 1979) adopted a case study approach to provide an on-going picture of how prime sponsors were implementing YCCIP and YETP programs.

II. The General Research Plan

The Youthwork National Policy Study chose the case study approach because of its flexibility in design and execution and, most important, because case study data are most useful in capturing the processes and on-going problems and successes of program development and implementation. In addition, these types of data easily lend themselves to a formative feedback design which is essential to the improvement of employment/educational programs for the low income/unemployed youth. The case studies have drawn heavily from the methodologies traditionally associated with anthropology, sociology and social psychology (see above review).

Throughout the period of the case study, the field researchers, one at each of the sites, have functioned as non-participant observers. Their overriding concern is with capturing and elucidating various dimensions of the site, especially those of natural behavior, natural setting, and natural treatment. As Tikunoff has written:

> Observing and recording natural behavior...demands that the researcher attend to factors such as the extent to which the observational methods a) intrude upon or restrict the potential for natural behavior to occur, and b) record what is observed in such a way that the complexities and multidimensionalities of the natural behavior are preserved.

The complexities of implementing multi-task programs in schools are difficult to capture with straight interview data and/or survey questionnaires. The field researchers have been trained in the application of the traditional emic approach to field work. This approach dictates that the observer should use the same criteria that informants use as they observe, interpret, and describe their own experiences. Variously described by other researchers as "folk system analysis," or studies of the "social construction of reality," the importance of the approach has been described by Ogbu:

> From this perspective the behavior of any group of people in schools, churches, or political rallies are not governed by an "objective reality out there," but by the "reality" they experience and interpret. Most studies document the middle class interpretations of the universe of these people. Although the theories that emerge may be self consistent, they do not represent accurately the "realities" they attempt to explain.

A) Data Sources

Field researchers used several data sources for their description and analysis of the in-school exemplary program with which they are affiliated. The basic strategy of data collection is that of a triangulation of data sources.

Non-participant observations. The field observer collects data through on-site, non-intrusive observations of various components of the project. Field notes are made of these observations and they form the basis for later organization and analysis of the key issues. This data collection strategy is generally undertaken at least one day per week for the duration of the case study effort. The focus of such observations are determined by the observer himself/herself, but oriented towards answering policy questions developed by the Department of Labor, Youthwork, and the staff of the Youthwork National Policy Study.

Written documents. Whenever possible, the field researcher has obtained copies or abstracts of all written records pertinent to the exemplary program. These include evaluation reports, memoranda, announcements, internal communications, non-confidential assessments of student performance, formal contracts of association, and the like.

Focused interviews. As the third pivot of the data collection strategy, focused interviews have been used to clarify matters either observed or read about. These interviews seek to provide an assessment of the situation from the view of the respondents, be they teachers, students, private sector sponsors or school administrators. The aim of these interviews was not to develop psychological profiles or clinical explanations for project related events, but to gain an understanding of how various participants have defined their participation in the program and how such interpretations are or are not consonant with those of other actors. Likewise, emic understandings of the program activities can be gained from such focused interviews.

B) Organization and Analysis of Field Notes

Systematic and analytical observations depend upon the recording of complete, accurate, and detailed field notes. The documentation of the observation took place as soon after witnessing the event as possible. The field researchers were cautioned as to the inhibiting nature of using mechanical devices for the recording of events. Unless otherwise agreed upon with the individual site observer, no mechanical devices were used during on-site observations for the recording of material. The observers were instructed in styles of note taking and the manner in which the notes were to be converted into field protocols. These protocols are the key data source for the subsequent analysis of the policy issues. Protocols are produced in conjunction with the local project. One copy of all protocols remains with the field observer and one copy is sent to the National Project Director, Dr. Ray C. Rist. All field notes are read by Cornell staff so that glaring omissions, contradictions, and difficult to understand statements can be clarified by the field observer while the material is still in recent memory.

Distilling these voluminous protocols requires a series of coding and editing steps. This has been undertaken by the Cornell staff and done according to a framework necessary to answer the key policy questions. Further, this effort will allow for a standard editorial style to evolve across all case studies. The detraction of multiple editorial approaches has often been apparent from case study material in the past.

C) Validity

The validity of naturalistic case study material depends greatly upon the manner in which the data are recorded, the sensitivities of the field researcher and the quality of the editing from the protocols. There are at least three sources of validity for naturalistic data and which are applicable to this present study: ecological (external) validity; phenomenological (internal) validity; and contextual validity. In naturalistic research, the data are considered to be valid if they reflect or describe what actually is — what has occurred, what conditions exist, what interactions have taken place, etc.

Ecological validity is based on the accurate portrayal of the setting. If the account of the setting has been reproduced so as to describe the setting in its natural form, then ecological validity is established. Field accounts must preserve the integrity of the natural setting. It was a key task of the project director and his staff to monitor continually the field protocols to examine how authentic is the reproduction of the setting by the observer, i.e., how strong is the "goodness of fit" between the data and the setting. Internal validity is achieved within naturalistic research when the descriptions of the events, situations, and interactions among actors are such that they accurately reflect the perceptions and intentions of the actors themselves. The goal is the presentation of the material in such a way as to understand "from the inside" why it is that actions occurred as they did. The observer seeks to understand how those who were involved interpreted what they and others around them were doing. Contextual validity comes from the accurate capturing of the "natural business" of the actors in the setting such that to an outsider reading the protocols, the rhythm and routine of the setting become apparent. The descriptions of the setting should "ring true" due to their fullness of description and ability to make the setting understandable to outsiders.

D) On-Site Observer Training

On-site observers have undergone two, three day training sessions conducted by the project director, Dr. Ray C. Rist. These training sessions covered basic aspects of observational research as well as particular strategies necessary for gathering data relevant to the analysis of the policy questions. The basic curriculum for the training sessions was developed by the director over the past four years while conducting comparable training exercises. The first training sessions were held in October/November 1978 and the second in March/April 1979.

The first training sessions were used to acquaint the newly hired observers with the initial foci of the research effort and to examine the basic skills observers would need for their field experience. Emphasis was placed on describing how to triangulate data sources (printed matter, observations, formal interviews) and the best ways to approach acquiring data which would help answer the key policy questions. The second training session involved further specification of the issues to be examined in the remainder of the year. Also, training dealt with particular problems incurred by observers during their first six months on site. A third emphasis of this second training was a review of the nature and value of in-depth focused interviewing.

E) Reports from On-Site Observers

Two forms of data are produced by the on-site observers. The first is a copy of each and every protocol generated by the observer during any data collection endeavor, be that effort one of interviewing, non-participant observing, or the collection of written materials. These were gathered together by the project director and staff so as to maintain a continuous monitoring system of field produced material. To date (May, 1979) 1426 such protocols have been produced and mailed to the Cornell office.

The second form of data transmitted from the on-site observers are analytic narratives written in response to questions sent by the Cornell staff. The questions involve an analysis of various dimensions related to the key policy questions guiding this entire research effort.

III. Strengths and Limitations of the Data

The major strength of the data which have been collected is derived from the longitudinal nature of the research design. The single most apparent weakness in most research efforts attempting to document and analyze program implementation is that they lack a sufficient longitudinal perspective. A number of studies have utilized what could more aptly be described as a cross-sectional approach in contrast to studying the program in question over time.

Another major strength of the data is that long term participation in the social system allows one to become aware of the subtle nuances, the brief references that only have meaning to those within the system, the gaps between word and deed and the official versus the unofficial notions of how the roles and tasks for various participants are defined. A weakness of quantitative designs is that they assume that behavior can be abstracted and measured accurately. The abstraction of various scores and test results can only give indication of output, not of process.

A basic epistomological assumption underlies the selection of direct observation as the primary research strategy employed in this study. Direct observation can make positive contributions to the study of the context of human and institutional behavior. The problems of bias or preconception may be critical to the interpretation given in the data, nevertheless, there will exist an account of the behavior relatively independent of the interpretations drawn from that account.

Second, the observations at the sites were selective. Observers were instructed to look for situations which would contribute to an analysis of the key policy issues. They were encouraged to vary both the day of the week and the times of day when they visited sites. This meant that data was not collected over a whole spectrum of issues or over the entire time span of the program. By varying the times of day and days of the week of site visits, the hope was to accumulate specified information from all types of settings. Subsequently, it was not possible to determine the situational antecedent causal factors which were unknown and may have directly impinged on the behavior then being observed. Thus, there was an imperative for continuous visits to the site in order to gain over time a perspective of what constituted the "typical" or "normal" patterns of interaction.

A third limitation was the blanket promise of anonymity to those observed and interviewed. Particular methods of data collection had to be evaluated in light of whether it would insure protection to those involved. This consideration resulted in the loss of one important form of data. Data could not be reported which had been collected if it would have given strong clues as to the identity of the site or respondent involved. In promising all site personnel they would remain unidentified, they were assured that statements made by them would not be reported to their superiors.

IV. Forging New Relationships: The CETA/School Nexus

This report is an interim report on the form and content of CETA/school relations which emerged during the first nine months of the Youthwork program, September 1978 to May 1979. The report addresses the circumstances and incentives which either facilitate or hinder the ability of CETA prime sponsors and local educational agencies to come together to develop innovative education and training programs for low income youth.

The intent of coordination between prime sponsors and local educational agencies is to improve the transition from school to work for adolescent youth by providing opportunities for occupational maturation and by removing any impediments that hinder the transition from school to work. Opportunities for occupational maturation include the development of personal competencies required of workers in the adult labor market as well as basic education and training to develop job skills leading to unsubsidized jobs in the public and private sectors. The goals of the in-school YEDPA programs relate to the needs of young people in regard to both long term career development and more immediate job search and placement activities. Attainment of a high school degree, acquisition of basic academic and coping skills, opportunity for career exploration, increased knowledge about the labor market and specific jobs, training and educational opportunities as well as an opportunity to earn money to stay in our return to school are among the outcomes sought for young people under YEDPA.

The staff of the Youthwork National Policy Study developed an analysis packet entitled, "Employment Training and Education: The Interrelationships of Delivery Systems," to answer questions related to the relationship between CETA prime sponsors and local educational agencies. Observers at each of the cooperating sites (40 of the 48) documented the relationship between the two delivery systems in an attempt to answer the question: To what extent do CETA prime sponsors and local educational agencies cooperate and under what conditions? Areas of interest include communication, collaboration, awareness of and effect of 22 percent incentive, and duplication of services.

A second analysis packet, entitled "Emergent Sustaining Relationships of the Delivery Systems," was the result of a continuing dialogue between the field observers and the Cornell staff. This dialogue identified several key issues which needed greater clarification and specificity. The two analysis packets are presented in their entirity in the following pages. The first analysis packet, covering CETA/school relations, was distributed to on-site observers in the Fall of 1978. The second analysis packet, a more focused statement of several key issues, was distributed in February 1979. These were the primary data collection instruments for the report "Forging New Relationships: The CETA/School Nexus."

EMPLOYMENT TRAINING AND EDUCATION: THE INTERRELATIONSHIPS OF DELIVERY SYSTEMS

This analysis packet has been prepared for the National Cross-Site Assessment of the Exemplary In-School Demonstration Project, Youthwork, Inc. Any questions concerning its content or use should be directed to the National Director of Cross-Site Assessment, Dr. Ray C. Rist, College of Human Ecology, Cornell University.

October 1978

EMPLOYMENT TRAINING AND EDUCATION: THE INTERRELATIONSHIPS OF DELIVERY SYSTEMS

Introduction

School systems and CETA have both come to serve vital roles in addressing the critical issue of youth unemployment. At present, both provide a conduit for programs addressed to youth. The generic question to be addressed then, given the participation of schools and CETA in the matter of youth unemployment, is in what manner do the schools and CETA respond to the employment, educational, and training needs of youth. Assuming that each system has developed its own modus operandi, it becomes a wise use of resources and effort to ascertain the various contributions of each effort so as to, in the future, target resources towards that system which is better suited to perform a particular function. Thus one does not confront a situation of "either/or," but one of deciding whether to accentuate one dimension or another of what is in fact a complementary relationship. In this light, the following areas need to be researched and analyzed:

I. Delivery Systems' Unique Contributions and Strengths

A. YEDPA Target Group legislation aims to involve the economically disadvantaged in work and/or training programs, hoping that this high risk group will not then at a later time enter the ranks of the unemployed.

1) Who is the target group? Is it the economically disadvantaged?

2) If there has been a shift in the target group, what is the basis for it?

3) Are females included?

4) How is the target group recruited and selected?

5) Do the two systems reach different target groups? Why?

B. Local Community

To facilitate the transition from school to work YEDPA hopes to enhance, strengthen, or create links between groups in the community that come into contact with the target group youth.

1) How is "local community" defined?

2) What are the linkages to the local community? Who initiates contact?

3) What is the purpose of working with another community group? When does one group get in touch with another? Who sustains the relation? Does one community group refer others to programs?

4) Describe key incidents where program people interact with "local community" people.

5) Does one system attract or establish ties with a certain type of community program? (e.g., are schools better able to work with public officials whereas CETA does better with labor?) Why?

6) Does the program make itself visible to the community?

C. Program Characteristics

Each demonstration project promises a unique program feature that addresses the problem of training and work for youth.

1) What is the unique contribution of the YEDPA program in relation to other local education and CETA programs for youth?

2) Do some programs create alternative or innovative employment systems? In what way are they considered innovative or alternative?

3) Why are some youth attracted to certain programs, and not others?

4) Describe the relationships between supervisors and youth.

II. Emergent Sustaining Relationships of the Delivery Systems

A. Communication Channels

There is reason to assume that two organizations who work with the same clients and for the same end would function better if in communication with each other.

1) What are the communication channels?

2) Are lines of permanent communication developed?

3) What hinders/enhances communication between the two systems?

4) When do the two systems work together? Describe the purpose of the interchange. Who are the key players?

5) Where is the program physically located?

B. Collaboration Styles

Systems may develop collaboration styles that are sufficient for their purposes and unique to their organization.

1) What is the mode of working together? (Cooperation, shared decision-making, information giving, other?)

2) Is cooperation necessary? Does it happen when key decisions are made?

3) Did the 22 percent incentive bring the systems together? What do the systems feel about this federal tactic?

C. Program Characteristics

One goal of YEDPA has been to create new work and training programs not already included in CETA and schools.

1) Are the YEDPA programs in fact new employment opportunities for youth, or are they duplications of options already available?

2) Are youth who belong to one training/education system doing the same type of activities in another system? Describe.

3) Does the exemplary grant affect YETP 22 percent programs?

4) If multiple delivery systems are in place, how have the two systems set up the administration of their programs?

--Did they design delivery of services together?

--What were the compromises? What are the ramifications?

--How have they integrated the delivery of services?

--Are the services coordinated? Does their method of coordination enhance or detract from the delivery of services?

III. Reciprocal Impact that Programs Have on Delivery Systems

A. Impact on Schools

When bringing together the employment training and education systems, it is important to know if this is a one-shot attempt or a program experiment that will have long range impact, a seed program that will bear fruit in both anticipated and unanticipated ways.

1) In what ways, if any, has the school system responded to the CETA emphasis on programs oriented toward disadvantaged youth by redefining and reorienting programs for the benefit of these youth?

2) Does the school's cooperation with CETA extend beyond the life of the YEDPA program, end with the program, or integrate into other areas of the school organization?

3) Do the schools involve the local community in developing plans in the delivery of services to youth and in activities which better use community resources for the benefit of youth?

4) What are the structural barriers/facilitators for success/failure of program implementation?

B. Impact on CETA

The In-School component of YEDPA encourages close collaboration between schools and CETA so that clearer role definition of responsibilities involved in employment training for youth results.

1) Are there changes in the CETA/school relationships that extend beyond the life of the program?

2) Does CETA define a role for itself vis-a-vis employment training for youth in the schools? Are there clear, mutual expectations about who does what for whom?

METHODS

Choice of data collection methods for information about the issues concerning the relationships between the two delivery systems assumes an appropriate fit between the question and the lens for viewing the situation.

Observations of key incidents in the daily program operation can reveal insights about the dynamics of the systems' relationships. Description of moments when members of different groups confer about program procedures, when a youth and staff member work together, when staff contact local business are all means of data collection. Detailed descriptions of the content and quality of these common occurrences will help generate hypotheses about the program's relationship to the education and employment training systems.

Interviews with program participants and contacts in both systems will help the observer check out the focus of his lens, and the meaning that these incidents hold for them. A continuing dialogue between the observer and setting participants assures that the observer is on track, and that he/she describes incidents important to the participants.

Records, reports, documents, and newspapers should all provide the observer with backgound for the inquiry and assure that he/she will go beyond historical data in observations and interviews.

EMERGENT SUSTAINING RELATIONSHIPS
OF THE DELIVERY SYSTEMS

This analysis packet has been prepared for the National Cross-Site Assessment of the Exemplary In-School Demonstration Project, Youthwork, Inc. Any questions concerning its content or use should be directed to the National Director of Cross-Site Assessment, Dr. Ray C. Rist, College of Human Ecology, Cornell University.

February, 1979

EMERGENT SUSTAINING RELATIONSHIPS OF THE DELIVERY SYSTEMS

This analysis packet intends to help you focus your inquiry on the relationships between CETA and the schools. Your original lens for viewing the relationship has been the Youthwork YETP project. By close examination of project contacts with schools and with CETA, some observers have described the communication channels, collaboration styles, and program characteristics unique or similar to other school or CETA programs.

A. Communication Channels

There is reason to assume that two organizations who work with the same clients and for the same end would function better if in communication with each other. The YETP intends to create new programs that help potential dropouts and the unemployed get high school diplomas and prepare for work. It is important to know when and if the program interfaces with CETA and the schools (e.g., CETA or school administration, staff, programs, planning), or if it is a separate entity.

1. When do the two systems work together? Describe the purpose of the interchange. Are these channels new, or were they in operation before the current Youthwork YETP? Who are the key players?
2. Where is the Youthwork YETP physically located?

B. Collaboration Styles

Systems may develop collaboration styles that are sufficient for their purposes and unique to their organization. When reporting the communication channels, it is important to further note how the systems collaborate, as well as why they work together in that way.

1. What is the mode of working together? (Cooperation, shared decision-making, information giving, other?)

2. Did the 22 percent incentive bring the systems together? What do the systems feel about this federal tactic? How do the schools spend the 22 percent?

3. What hinders/enhances communication between the two systems? (CETA, school, and/or project staff attitudes toward CETA, the schools, or federal government may influence how much cooperation actually occurs or is likely to occur. The federal government sometimes frustrates staff with ambiguous regulations or timing constraints. Staff leadership may overcome communication barriers and find creative solutions to collaboration problems.)

C. Program Characteristics' Response to Target Population Needs

One goal of YETP has been to create new work and training programs for the target population not already included in CETA or the schools. Data in several protocols indicate that a service overlap exists in some locations. Your inquiry should address the nature of such an overlap or the distinguishing characteristics of your program.

1. Are the YETP programs in fact new employment opportunities for youth, or are they duplications of options already available?

2. Are youth who belong to one training/education system doing the same type of activities in another system? Describe.

3. If multiple delivery systems are in place, how have the two systems set up the administration of their programs? Are the services coordinated? What contributes to the ease or problems of coordination? Does their method of coordination enhance or detract from the delivery of services?

REFERENCES

ASCH, S.E. (1952) Social Psychology. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

BECKER, H.S. (1955) "Careers in a deviant occupational group." Social Problems 2, 2.

BELLACK, A.A. [ed.] (1966) Theory and Research in Teaching. New York: Teachers College Press (Columbia University).

BIDDLE, B.J. and R.S. ADAMS (1967) "An analysis of classroom activities." Columbia: University of Missouri Center for Research in Social Behavior.

CLARK, M. (1947) "Racial identification and preference in Negro children," in A.H. Passow (ed.) Education in Depressed Areas. New York: Columbia Univ. Press.

GOFFMAN, E. (1963) Asylums. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday.

GOODMAN, M. (1952) Race Awareness in Young Children. New York: Collier.

GOULDNER, A. (1959) "Reciprocity and autonomy in functional theory," in L. Gross (ed.) Symposium on Sociological Theory. New York: Harper & Row.

__________(1954) Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy. New York: Free Press.

HATCH, D. (1948) "Changes in the structure and functions of a rural New England community since 1900." Ph.D. dissertation. Harvard University.

HENRY, J. (1963) Culture Against Man. New York: Random House.

HENSLIN, J. (1967) "The cab driver: an interactional analysis of an occupational culture." Ph.D. dissertation. Washington University, St. Louis.

HUMPHREYS, R.A. (1970) Tearoom Trade: Impersonal Sex in Public Places. Chicago: Aldine.

KATZ, E. (1957) "Leadership stability and social change: an experiment with small groups." Sociometry 20.

LIEBOW, E. (1967) Tally's Corner. Boston: Little, Brown.

LYND, H. and R. LYND (1928) Middletown. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.

MALINOWSKI, B. (1922) The Argonauts of the Western Pacific. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

POLSKY, N. (1967) Hustler, Beats, and Others. Chicago: Aldine.

RIST, R. (1970) "Student Social Class and Teacher Expectations: The Self-fulfilling Prophecy in Ghetto Education," Harvard Educational Review. Vol. 40, no. 3.

__________(1973) The Urban School: A Factory For Failure. Cambridge: M.I.T. Press.

__________(1978) The Invisible Children: School Desegregation in American Society. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

__________(1979) Desegregated Schools: Appraisals of An American Experiment. New York: Academic Press.

SCHEFF, T. (1966) Being Mentally Ill. Chicago: Aldine.

SMITH, L. and W. GEOFFREY (1968) The Complexities of the Urban Classroom New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

VALENTINE, C. (1968) Culture and Poverty. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.

WHYTE, W. (1943) Street Corner Society. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.